3 1761 04257 2719

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/nationalindustri00natiuoft

National Industrial Conference, Ottawa, 1919

CANADA

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

Of Dominion and Provincial Governments with Representative Employers and Labour Men, on the subjects of Industrial Relations and Labour Laws, and for the consideration of the Labour Features of the Treaty of Peace.

OTTAWA, SEPTEMBER 15-20, 1919

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

together with various Memoranda relating to the Conference and the Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations.

Proceedings and Discussions reported by the Official Reporters of the Senate of Canada.

Issued by the Department of Labour of Canada.

OTTAWA
J. DE LABROQUERIE TACHÉ
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1919

69316—A

HC
N2758n

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

Of Dominion and Provincial Governments with Representatives of Employers and Labour Men, on the subjects of Industrial Relations and Labour Laws, and for the Consideration of the Labour Features of the Treaty of Peace.

OTTAWA, SEPTEMBER 15-20, 1919

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

together with various Memoranda relating to the Conference and the Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations.

Presentation and Discussions reported by the Official Reporters of the Senate of Canada

Issued by the Department of Labour of Canada

REPORT OF NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1. Introductory.
2. Resolutions of the Conference.
3. Agenda of the Conference and various memoranda relating thereto.
4. Text of the Labour Features of the Treaty of Peace.
5. Statistics of industrial disputes in Canada, 1901-1919, by industries, by provinces and by causes and results.
6. Summary of Dominion and Provincial laws relating to industrial disputes.
7. Memorandum regarding hours of labour in Canada.
8. Memorandum regarding hours of labour in other countries.
9. Summary of Provincial minimum wage laws.
10. Memorandum on minimum wages legislation in other countries.
11. Daily report of the proceedings and discussions of the Conference.
12. Appendix—Text of Report of Royal Commission on Industrial Relations and of minority report by Messrs. White and Pausé, and supplementary statement of Commissioner Riordon.

INTRODUCTORY.

The present volume contains a report of the proceedings and discussions and various memoranda relating to the National Industrial Conference of the Dominion and Provincial Governments of Canada with representative employers and labour men on the subjects of Industrial Relations and Labour Laws and for the consideration of the Labour Features of the Treaty of Peace. This Conference was held in the Senate Chamber, Ottawa, on September 15-20, 1919, on invitation of the Government of Canada.

There were present representatives of the Dominion Government and Provincial Governments, including three of the Provincial Premiers, the Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Leader of the Liberal Party in Canada, and an equal number of delegates representing respectively the interests of employers and employees in all branches of trade and industry throughout Canada.

The delegates who attended on behalf of employers and employees were selected on the one hand by the national associations representative of the manufacturing interests, lumbering, building and construction, mining, fisheries, wholesalers, retailers, bankers, etc., of the entire country, and on the other hand by the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada and the Civil Service Federation. Railway transportation and telegraphs were represented by the members of the Canadian Railway Board of Adjustment No. 1, composed of representatives of the railway companies and of the railway brotherhoods who have had to do with the adjustment of various disputes affecting these industries during the past year.

A Third Group was also in attendance composed of the members of the Labour Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee of the Canadian Cabinet, the members of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, from whom the proposal emanated for convening an industrial conference, delegates appointed by the Union of Canadian Municipalities, representatives of Canadian agriculture, to which it had been found impossible to grant representation in the employers' and employees' groups on account of their being no body from which delegates on behalf of farm labour could be appointed; representatives of various engineering societies, of the returned soldiers, and a few others who attended neither as employers or employees but rather on behalf of the interests of the public in general.

The employers' and employees' groups together numbered 176. The Third Group numbered 34.

The Right Honourable Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, was to have presided over the Conference, but was unfortunately prevented by illness from doing so. In his absence the Honourable G. D. Robertson, Minister of Labour, served as Chairman, being assisted by Mr. C. A. Magrath, of Ottawa and by Sir John Willison, of Toronto, both members of the Third Group, as Vice-Chairman.

All of the arrangements for the meeting were approved before the assembling of the Conference by a Joint Committee of Employers and Employees, selected by the respective groups and presided over by Mr. C. A. Magrath. The sessions were open to the press and public and attracted many visitors, including a number of the Senators and Members of Parliament and representatives of employers' and employees' organizations from the United States.

The text of the agenda and resolutions of the Conference appear on the introductory pages of the present volume and also in the daily reports of the proceedings and discussions which follow.

For purposes of reference it has been thought convenient to include in the present volume the text of various printed memoranda which were prepared and circulated in advance of the opening of the Conference, also the text of the Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations.

GERALD H. BROWN,
Secretary, National Industrial Conference.

Ottawa, September 22, 1919.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE.

INDUSTRIAL LABOUR LAWS.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE—ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Resolved:

That the advantage of uniformity in the laws relating to the welfare of those engaged in industrial work in the several provinces of the Dominion of Canada be brought to the attention of the Government of Canada and of the Governments of the several provinces respectively; and, that this National Industrial Conference suggests the following as a means towards the end desired, namely:

The appointment of a Board composed as follows:

(1) As respects the Dominion:
- (a) A representative of the Government.
- (b) A representative of the employers.
- (c) A representative of the employees.

(2) As respects each of the provinces:
- (a) A representative of the Government.
- (b) A representative of the employers.
- (c) A representative of the employees.

AND that the Dominion Government be requested to ask the Government of each of the provinces to select or have selected representatives in respect of the province as above set forth.

J. R. SHAW,
P. THOMSON,
A. MONRO GRIER,
For Employers.

JOSEPH GORMAN,
JAS. SOMERVILLE,
JAS. WINNING,
For Employees.

FRASER S. KEITH,
JOHN LOWE,
For Group Three.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE—ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Believing that there are defects in the system of Electoral Representation in Canada, which defects are stated by the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations to be a contributory cause of social and political unrest, this Conference welcomes the declaration of the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Government, that a Speaker's Conference will be called to investigate the merits of the Proportional System, and urges that such action be taken without delay.

J. S. WILLISON,
Chairman.

JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE—ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Your Committee is of the opinion that there is urgent necessity for greater co-operation between employer and employee. We believe that this co-operation can be furthered by the establishment of Joint Industrial Councils. Your Committee does not believe it is wise or expedient to recommend any set plan for such Councils.

We therefore recommend that a Bureau should be established by the Department of Labour of the Federal Government to gather data and furnish information whenever requested by employers and employees or organizations of employers or employees that whenever it is desired to voluntarily establish such councils the fullest assistance should be given by the Bureau.

F. W. WELSH
D. A. CAREY,
OMER FLEURY,
D. STRACHAN,
WILLS MACLACHLAN,
F. J. GERNANDT,
F. P. JONES,
DAVID CARNEGIE.

STATE INSURANCE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT, SICKNESS, INVALIDITY AND OLD AGE.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE—ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

This Committee unanimously endorses the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations that a Board or Boards be appointed to inquire into the Subjects of State Insurance against Unemployment, Sickness, Invalidity and Old Age.

For the effective carrying out of the above this Committee recommends:

1st. That such Board or Boards shall be representative of the interests participating in this Conference, viz., the Government, the public, the employer and the employee, and shall include a representative of the women of Canada.

2nd. That in order to collect necessary data, the Government shall forthwith attach to the proper branches of the Labour or other departments concerned experienced investigators, who shall do the necessary research work and furnish to the Board at the earliest opportunity the results of their investigations.

3rd. That the Government shall set a time limit for the receipt of the report and recommendations as to the advisability of enacting legislation.

4th. While this Committee has been appointed to consider only the questions of State Insurance against Unemployment, Sickness, Invalidity and Old Age, it respectfully recommends that the subject of "widows' pensions" be added.

W. R. ROLLO,
HENRY BERTRAM,
W. E. SEGSWORTH,
KATHLEEN DERRY,
J. S. McLEAN,
R. C. McCUTCHEON,
F. H. WHITTON,
G. FRANK BEER.

MINIMUM WAGE LAWS.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE—ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Whereas it is considered expedient that minimum rates of wage should be fixed throughout Canada for women and children, whether employed at a time rate or according to any other method of remuneration;

Whereas Minimum Wage Laws for women and children have been enacted in five and are now in operation in four of the provinces;

Therefore, be it resolved that this Industrial Conference recommend to the Governments of all those provinces, which have not adopted Minimum Wage Laws for Women and Children, the speedy investigation of the necessity for such laws, and, if so found, the enactment of such legislation.

It is further recommended that the various provinces throughout the Dominion adopt a uniform law and method of application, but that in all cases the minimum of wages for women and children is to be determined from time to time, due regard being given to local living conditions.

It is the opinion of this Conference that the Dominion Government should appoint a Royal Commission, composed equally of representatives of Labour, Employers, and the Public, to investigate wages to unskilled workers and issue a report.

Representation has been made to the Committee that the remuneration paid female school teachers in one of the larger provinces of the Dominion is so low as to discourage the employment of the talent necessary to the proper education of its citizens. Your Committee recommends that the various Provincial Governments be asked to investigate such conditions, in the respective provinces, to the end that the children of all provinces of the Dominion have equal educational opportunities.

JAMES B. THOMSON,
O. W. WALLER,
F. DANIELS,
For Employers' Group.
HELENA GUTTERIDGE,
E. W. A. O'DELL,
W. F. BUSH,
For Employees' Group.
THOS. CANTLEY,
R. B. MAXWELL,
For Third Group.

MISCELLANEOUS RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE No. 9 AND ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY THE CONFERENCE.

LAND SPECULATION AND HOUSING

REPORT OF COMMITTEE—ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Resolved:

That this Conference, recognizing that much industrial unrest, economic loss and social suffering has resulted from land speculation, poor and insufficient housing, and high rents, heartily commends the action of the Dominion and Provincial Governments in their united efforts to improve housing conditions and to provide facilities for the proper and satisfactory housing of our people and recommends increased co-operation of, and investigation by, the Dominion and Provincial Governments to find a satisfactory solution of the problem.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IN EDUCATION.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE—ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Resolved:

1. That this Conference endorses the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, as to the necessity of the extension of equal opportunities in education; and, in view of bringing about this reform;

That the Government of each province in Canada be asked to establish compulsory education for full time at least up to and including the fourteenth year, and for part time in cities and towns for the two ensuing years; and

That, in all provinces, education, in all grades should be made free, so that the child of the poorest paid worker be given the opportunity of reaching the highest educational institution.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND THE PRESS.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE—ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Resolved:

That we unanimously endorse paragraph 70 of the Report of the Royal Commission, as follows:

"(70) The restrictions placed upon the freedom of speech and the liberty of the press, and the denial of the right to read such literature as any portion of the public demanded, was given as one of the principal causes of the present industrial unrest. We have no comment to make upon the policy of the Government in this respect. During the war it was necessary in the interests of the whole country and of the Empire that individual liberty should in many directions be restrained, but we believe that restrictions should not be imposed upon either the freedom of speech or the freedom of the press unless such restrictions are urgently demanded in the interest of the peace of the whole community. We recognize that no person has a right to do anything that is liable to incite the people to commit unlawful acts. A line must be drawn between liberty and license, but care must be taken to avoid creating the impression that the restraints imposed upon the freedom of speech or the liberty of the press, are intended to prevent criticism of legislative or governmental action."

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE—ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Resolved:

(First) That in the opinion of this Conference adequate provision by public works or otherwise, should be made by the Federal, Provincial and Municipal Governments in connection with all interests represented at this Conference to avert any serious unemployment crisis which might occur during the ensuing eight months;

(Second) That the various interests represented at this Conference adhere strictly to the employment policy agreed upon by the Provincial Governments, which aims at the centralization of labour supply and demand in one agency.

(Third) That provision be made for immediate and continuous survey of available and prospective employment, and for adequate employment machinery to direct unemployed workers to employment available.

W. J. BULMAN,
E. G. HENDERSON,
E. J. DAVIS.
For Employers.

M. A. McINNES,
J. T. FOSTER,
GEO. SMITH.
For Employees.

T. LINSAY CROSSLEY,
For Third Group.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON ITEMS 2, 4 AND 6 OF AGENDA.

The following reports were received from Committees of the Conference and were ordered by the Conference to be laid on the table without division and to be embodied in the proceedings of the Conference.

COMMITTEE REPORTS RELATING TO ITEM 2 OF THE AGENDA RESPECTING HOURS OF LABOUR.

(EMPLOYERS' REPORT.)

The members of your Committee, appointed to represent Employers, beg to submit the following resolution:

RESOLVED that appropriate Government Commission, composed of an equal representation of Employers and Employees of the various Industrial, Producing and Distributing Industries, should be appointed to undertake investigations as to the adaptability of the hours of labour principles of the Peace Treaty to the different industries of the country, and to report as early as possible.

MELVILLE P. WHITE,
FRED ARMSTRONG,
E. M. TROWERN,
Representing Employers' Section.

(EMPLOYEES' REPORT.)

That we agree with the recommendations and finding of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, and urge the adoption of an 8-hour day by law throughout the Dominion, with due regard and recognition of the Saturday half-holiday, where same prevails and its possible extension.

In industries subjected to seasonal and climatic conditions, such as "farming," "fishing," and "logging," if it can be established by investigation that the operation of such law is impracticable, then exemption shall be granted such industries from the operation of such law.

D. MEAKIN,
WM. B. HUNTER,
J. A. McCLELLAND,
Representing Employees' Section.

(THIRD GROUP REPORT.)

We approve of the principle regarding employment and hours of labour set forth in the Treaty of Peace and in Paragraphs 50 to 53 inclusive, of the Report of the Royal Commission, and would recommend that the Governments of Canada enact legislation providing for such in all industries where it is now established by agreement, at the earliest opportunity, and after due investigation by a Commission, composed of representatives of Employers and Employees representing the various industries, legislation be enacted by the Governments of Canada providing for the same to be extended in all industries where it can be applied, having due regard to the curtailment of production and distribution.

CALVIN LAWRENCE,
R. P. ROGERS,
Representing Third Group.

COMMITTEE REPORTS REGARDING ITEM 4 OF THE AGENDA RESPECTING THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE, RECOGNITION OF LABOUR UNIONS, AND THE RIGHT TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.

(EMPLOYEES' REPORT)

The Labour Representatives of your Joint Committee, to whom was referred Item Number 4 of the revised agenda, viz.: consideration of (a) employees' right to organize; (b) recognition of labour unions; and, (c) the right to collective bargaining, respectfully submit the following report, with recommendations, for your favourable consideration:—

1. With a view to effecting and maintaining harmonious relations between employers and employees, this Conference declares the following principles and policies, and urges their adoption by all employers, relative to their respective employees:—

(a) the right of employees to organize;

(b) the recognition of labour unions;

(c) the right of employees to collective bargaining.

2. In these recommendations, without changing the generality of their terms,—

(a) "the right of employees to organize" means the right of employees to organize or form themselves into associations for lawful purposes.

(b) "the recognition of labour unions" means the right of employees, or their duly accredited representative or representatives, to recognition of their employer or employers, for the purpose of mutually arranging rules and regulations governing wages and working conditions.

(c) "the right of employees to collective bargaining" means the negotiation of agreements between employers or groups of employers, and employees or groups of employees, through the representative or representatives chosen by the respective parties themselves. Entering into agreements and bargaining collectively with an association or union of employees does not mean recognition of the "Closed Shop," unless the agreement so provides.

(d) "employer" or "employers" as used in clause 1 and 2, means any employer or employers of any industry and of Federal, Provincial and Municipal Governments.

3. That the Federal and Provincial Governments be urged to enact legislation applicable to industries within their respective jurisdiction, to make it unlawful for any employer who shall discharge or refuse to employ or in any manner discriminate against employees merely by reason of membership in labour unions or for legitimate labour union activities outside of working hours.

For the Employees' Section,

W. L. BEST,
A. C. HAY,
J. C. O'CONNOR.

(EMPLOYERS' REPORT.)

Your Committee recommend that:—

(a) Employers admit the right of Employees to join any lawful organization.

(b) Employers should not be required to recognize unions or to establish "Closed Shops."

Employers insist on the right, when so desired, to maintain their plants as "Open Shops," by which they mean that no employer should discriminate against any Employee because of the latter's membership or non-membership in any organization, and no Employee should interfere with any other Employee, because of the latter's membership or non-membership in any organization.

(c) Employers should not be required to negotiate except directly, with their own Employees or groups of their own Employees.

For the Employers' Section,

J. P. ANGLIN,
D. H. McDOUGALL,
A. B. WEEKS.

COMMITTEE REPORTS RELATING TO ITEM 6 OF THE AGENDA RESPECTING APPLICATION OF THE FINDINGS OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

(EMPLOYEES' REPORT.)

We concur in the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations that the findings of the Commission should be put into effect in all works controlled by all Government bodies where the principle of democratic management can be applied. We further recommend that employees of all Government bodies should be entitled to the right of appeal under the Industrial Disputes Act so long as that Act remains upon the statute of Canada.

We further recommend that the wages and working conditions of employees of Governments should not be less favourable then that which now exist for similar workers in the employment of private individuals or corporation.

F. GRIERSON,
A. R. MOSHER,
A. H. GILLIS,
Representing Employees' Section

(EMPLOYERS' REPORT.)

The undersigned members of your Committee beg leave to report that the matter referred to them does not in their judgment come within their province, but that it is entirely a question between the Governments and their employees concerned.

H. BLAIN,
ANGUS McLEAN,
T. R. DEACON,
Representing Employers' Section.

(THIRD GROUP REPORT.)

The representatives of the Third Group on this Committee believe that in so far as the findings of this Conference approve and such findings are to the benefit of the public weal, that the suggestions of the Royal Commission be put into effect in all departments and works controlled by the Government of this country.

(Signed) T. D. BOUCHARD,
R. R. GRANT,
Representatives of Third Group.

AGENDA

OF THE

National Industrial Conference

1. Consideration of the question of the desirability of unifying and co-ordinating the existing labour laws of the Dominion Parliament and of the Provincial Legislatures, and the consideration of any new labour laws which are deemed necessary.

2. Consideration of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations respecting hours of labour.

3. Consideration of minimum wage laws.

4. Consideration of:-
   (a) employees' right to organize;
   (b) recognition of labour unions;
   (c) the right of employees to collective bargaining.

5. Consideration of:
   (a) the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations in favour of the establishment of a bureau to promote the establishment and development of Joint Industrial Councils;
   (b) the further recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations regarding the establishment of Joint Plant and Industrial Councils.

6. Consideration of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations that the findings of the Commission be put into effect in all work controlled by the Government where the principles of democratic management can be applied.

7. Consideration of resolutions relating to any other features of the Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations.

8. Consideration of the labour features of the Treaty of Peace.

9. Consideration of any other proposals which may be introduced bearing on the relations of employers and employees.

MEMORANDA FOR REFERENCE PURPOSES ON THE VARIOUS ITEMS OF THE AGENDA

The National Industrial Conference of Dominion and Provincial Ministers and of representative labour men and employers, which has been summoned by the Government of Canada for the consideration of industrial relations and labour laws, grows out of the following proposal contained in the majority report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations:

"107. If it is finally decided that the enactment of any legislation necessary to give effect to our recommendations is not within the competence of the Parliament of Canada, we suggest that in order, if possible, to secure concerted action on the part of the different Provincial Legislatures, a conference should be held in the near future in the City of Ottawa. To this conference we suggest that the Premiers, or other members of the Governments of each Province, together with representative labour men and representative employers, be invited for the purpose of considering the whole question, and, if possible, arriving at a unanimous decision. We believe it is in the interest of harmony that concerted action along this line should be taken, and we know of no better means of bringing about unanimity. At such conference the question of unifying and co-ordinating the existing legislation bearing on the relations between employer and employees, now in force in the several Provinces and in the Dominion, might be carefully considered and reviewed."

Announcement of the intention of the Dominion Government to summon this Conference was made in the Speech from the Throne at the close of the last session of Parliament, as follows:

"Having regard to the necessity of avoiding industrial disturbance and with a view of ensuring more stable relations and a better understanding between employers and employed, my advisers intend to summon in the early future a representative Conference for friendly and intimate discussion of such questions, and for the consideration of the report of the Industrial Relations Commission and of the proposals therein set forth."

The first seven items on the agenda are based on the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations.

The eighth item on the proposed agenda of the Conference relates to the application to Canada of the labour features of the Treaty of Peace.

The ninth item is intended to offer an opportunity for the consideration of any other proposals which may be introduced at the Conference bearing on the relations of employers and employees.

Item 1. Consideration of the question of the desirability of unifying and co-ordinating the existing labour laws of the Dominion Parliament and of the Provincial Legislatures; and the consideration of any new labour laws which are deemed necessary.

Item 1 of the agenda is based on paragraph 107 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, the text of which is quoted above. The item is broad enough in its terms to include consideration of the laws relating to hours of labour and minimum wages. Item 2 and item 3 of the agenda, however, relate specifically to these respective subjects.

The subject of the federal and provincial laws relating to industrial disputes is one which may, perhaps, call for the attention of the Conference. A summary of these laws on pages xxxv-xxxix of the present papers.

The full text of the federal and provincial laws relating to industrial dis putes is contained in the reports on *Labour Legislation in Canada*, published by the Department of Labour, copies of which will be available for distribution a the Conference.

A statement of labour disputes which have occurred in Canada between th years 1901 and 1919, classified by industries by provinces and by causes, appear at pages xx-xxxiv of the present papers.

Item 2. Consideration of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Rela tions respecting hours of labour.

Paragraphs 47 to 53 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Industria Relations relate to hours of labour. Attention is also directed to the provisio of the labour conditions of the Treaty of Peace, which refers to the "adoptio of an eight-hour day or a 48-hour week as the standard to be aimed at where i has not already been attained," and also to the provision in the labour condition of the Treaty of Peace which refers to the "adoption of a weekly rest of at leas twenty-four hours, which should include Sunday wherever practicable."

A memorandum on hours of labour in Canada has been prepared for th purposes of the National Industrial Conference and appears on pages xl-xl of these papers.

The full text of the laws relating to hours of labour in Canada is containe in the reports on *Labour Legislation in Canada*, published by the Department o Labour, copies of which will be available for distribution at the Conference.

A separate memorandum on the eight-hour day movement abroad appear on pages xlvi-xlviii of the present papers.

Item 3. Consideration of minimum wage laws.

Reference is made to the subject of minimum wage legislation in paragrap 46 of the report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations. A memoran dum on the minimum wage laws of the provinces of Manitoba, British Columbia Saskatchewan and Quebec appears at pages xlix-li of the present papers.

The full text of the laws of Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan an Quebec, relating to minimum wages, is contained in the reports on *Labour Legis lation in Canada*, published by the Department of Labour, copies of which wil be available for distribution at the Conference.

A memorandum on the minimum wage laws of other countries appears a pages li-liv of the present papers.

Item 4. Consideration of:
(a) employees' right to organize;
(b) recognition of labour unions;
(c) the right of employees to collective bargaining.

The right of employees to organize and recognition of labour unions ar discussed in paragraphs 54 to 61 of the majority report of the Royal Commissio on Industrial Relations. In this connection attention is also directed to th labour conditions of the Treaty of Peace, in which it is declared that labou should not be regarded as merely an article of commerce, but that there ar methods and principles for regulating labour conditions which the individua communities should endeavour to apply as far as their special circumstance will permit, and that among these methods and principles which seem to the Hig Contracting Powers to be of special and urgent importance is "the right o association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers."

The subject of collective bargaining is discussed in paragraphs 62 to 66 of the report of the Royal Commission.

Item 5. Consideration of:

(a) the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations in favour of the establishment of a bureau to promote the establishment and development of joint industrial councils;

(b) the further recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations regarding the establishment of joint plant and industrial councils.

Paragraphs 73 to 101 of the report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations refer to various types of Joint Industrial Councils in operation at present.

The text of the reports of the "Whitley Committee" relative to the type of Joint Industrial Councils now being organized in various branches of industry in Great Britain is contained in a pamphlet published by the Department of Labour of Canada, copies of which will be available for distribution at the Conference.

Item 6. Consideration of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations that the findings of the Commission be put into effect in all work controlled by the Government where the principles of democratic management can be applied.

A statement on this subject will be made at the Conference.

Item 7. Consideration of resolutions relating to any other features of the Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations referred to on page 19 of the report.

Item 8. Consideration of the Labour Features of the Treaty of Peace.

The text of the Labour Features of the Treaty of Peace appears at page xviii of the present papers.

This item is intended to permit of the consideration of any other features of the report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations on which resolutions may be introduced.

Item 9. Consideration of any other proposals which may be introduced bearing on the relations of employers and employees.

No intimation has been given of any proposals which may be submitted to the Conference under this heading.

Section II.—General Principles.

The High Contracting Parties, recognizing that the well-being, physical, moral and intellectual, of industrial wage-earners is of supreme international importance, have framed, in order to further this great end, the permanent machinery provided for in Section I and associated with that of the League of Nations.

They recognize that differences of climate, habits and customs, of economic opportunity and industrial tradition, make strict uniformity in the conditions of labour difficult of immediate attainment. But, holding as they do, that labour should not be regarded merely as an article of commerce, they think that there are methods and principles for regulating labour conditions which all industrial communities should endeavour to apply, so far as their special circumstances will permit.

Among these methods and principles, the following seem to the High Contracting Parties to be of special and urgent importance:—

First.—The guiding principle above enunciated that labour should not be regarded merely as a commodity or article of commerce.

Second.—The right of association for all lawful purposes by the employed as well as by the employers.

Third.—The payment to the employed of a wage adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of life as this is understood in their time and country.

Fourth.—The adoption of an eight-hour day or a forty-eight-hour week as the standard to be aimed at where it has not already been attained.

Fifth.—The adoption of a weekly rest of at least twenty-four hours, which should include Sunday wherever practicable.

Sixth.—The abolition of child labour and the imposition of such limitations on the labour of young persons as shall permit the continuation of their education and assure their proper physical development.

Seventh.—The principle that men and women should receive equal remuneration for work of equal value.

Eighth.—The standard set by law in each country with respect to the conditions of labour should have due regard to the equitable economic treatment of all workers lawfully resident therein.

Ninth.—Each State should make provision for a system of inspection in which women should take part, in order to ensure the enforcement of the laws and regulations for the protection of the employed.

Without claiming that these methods and principles are either complete or final, the High Contracting Parties are of opinion that they are well fitted to guide the policy of the League of Nations; and that, if adopted by the industrial communities who are members of the League, and safeguarded in practice by an adequate system of such inspection, they will confer lasting benefits upon the wage-earners of the world.

VARIOUS MEMORANDA

relating to the

National Industrial Conference

of

Dominion and Provincial Governments of Canada

With representative Employers and Labour Men

On the subjects of Industrial Relations and Labour Laws, and for the consideration of the Labour Features of the Treaty of Peace.

OTTAWA

SEPTEMBER, 1919

PRINTED BY DIRECTION OF THE MINISTER OF LABOUR OF CANADA

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES IN CANADA, 1901-1919

The following statistics of industrial disputes in Canada, classified by industries, by provinces, and by causes and results, cover the period from Jan. 1, 1901 to June 30, 1919, and are compiled from the official returns published by the Department of Labour of Canada. In addition to the summary tables for the period of eighteen and a half years in question, summary tables are also presented herewith relating to the industrial disputes which have occurred during the first half of the present calendar year.

SUMMARY OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY INDUSTRIES, 1901 TO JUNE 30, 1919.

Industry.	Number of disputes	Employees involved.	Time loss in working days
Fishing	13	16,727	253,088
Lumbering	42	12,888	304,344
Mines, smelters, quarries, clay products, etc.	197	136,877	5,760,928
Building and construction	462	88,230	1,854,703
Metals, machinery and conveyances	426	126,204	2,358,702
Woodworking	60	6,151	117,360
Printing and allied trades	52	6,242	76,378
Clothing	204	49,560	1,241,827
Textiles	58	25,604	375,188
Foods, liquors and tobacco	115	13,842	228,380
Leather	25	1,032	20,320
Transportation	232	89,441	1,537,970
Miscellaneous	100	9,809	141,130
Unskilled labour	96	25,741	521,631
Railway, canal and harbour construction	3	685	48,358
Chemicals and explosives	4	566	6,891
Public utilities	22	5,555	54,714
Municipal employment	16	5,081	35,299
Total	2,127	620,235	14,937,229

TABLE OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY INDUSTRIES, JANUARY 1, 1919 TO JUNE 30, 1919

Industry	Number of disputes	Employers involved	Time loss in working days
Lumbering	4	2,545	[illegible]
Mines, smelters, quarries, clay products, etc.	14	4,524	[illegible]
Railway, canal, and harbour construction	3	685	[illegible]
Building and construction	23	7,231	[illegible]
Metals, machinery and conveyances	55	62,163	[illegible]
Woodworking	3	320	[illegible]
Pulp and paper	4	981	[illegible]
Printing and Publishing	4	210	[illegible]
Clothing	14	1,910	[illegible]
Textiles	5	1,745	[illegible]
Foods, liquors and tobacco	11	5,244	[illegible]
Chemicals and explosives	2	95	[illegible]
Leather	1	40	[illegible]
Transportation	20	9,856	[illegible]
Public utilities	10	1,657	[illegible]
Municipal employment	6	541	[illegible]
Miscellaneous	10	1,198	[illegible]
Total	189	105,028	[illegible]

RECORD OF TRADE DISPUTES BY INDUSTRIES AND YEARS

Industry.	Year	Number of disputes	Employers involved	Employees involved	Time loss in working days
Fishing	1901	2	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1902	1	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1903	1	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1904	2	13	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1905	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1906	1	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1907	1	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1908	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1909	2	5	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1910	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1911	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1912	1	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1913	2	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1914	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1915	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1916	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1917	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1918	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
(To June 30)	1919	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
		13	55	16,737	253,068

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES IN CANADA, 1901-1919

The following statistics of industrial disputes in Canada, classified by industries, by provinces, and by causes and results, cover the period from Jan. 1, 1901, to June 30, 1919, and are compiled from the official returns published by the Department of Labour of Canada. In addition to the summary tables for the period of eighteen and a half years in question, summary tables are also presented herewith relating to the industrial disputes which have occurred during the first half of the present calendar year.

SUMMARY OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY INDUSTRIES, 1901 TO JUNE 30, 1919.

Industry.	Number of disputes	Employees involved.	Time loss in working days
Fishing	13	16,727	253,088
Lumbering	42	12,888	304,344
Mines, smelters, quarries, clay products, etc	197	136,877	5,760,928
Building and construction	462	88,230	1,854,703
Metals, machinery and conveyances	426	126,204	2,358,702
Woodworking	60	6,151	117,360
Printing and allied trades	52	6,242	76,378
Clothing	204	49,560	1,241,827
Textiles	58	25,604	375,188
Foods, liquors and tobacco	115	13,842	228,389
Leather	25	1,032	20,320
Transportation	232	89,441	1,537,970
Miscellaneous	100	9,809	141,130
Unskilled labour	96	25,741	521,631
Railway, canal and harbour construction	3	685	48,358
Chemicals and explosives	4	566	6,891
Public utilities	22	5,555	54,714
Municipal employment	16	5,081	55,299
Total	2,127	620,235	14,937,229

TABLE OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY INDUSTRIES, JANUARY 1, 1919 TO JUNE 30, 1919

Industry	Number of disputes	Employees involved	Time loss in working days
Lumbering	8	2,345	37,895
Mines, smelters, quarries, clay products, etc.	14	4,720	140,562
Railway, canal, and harbour construction	3	685	48,750
Building and construction	23	7,231	150,971
Metals, machinery and conveyances	55	62,103	1,346,758
Woodworking	2	320	1,440
Pulp and paper	8	983	20,481
Printing and Publishing	5	219	2,714
Clothing	13	3,919	46,676
Textiles	5	1,745	51,391
Foods, liquors and tobacco	11	5,244	39,973
Chemicals and explosives	2	96	951
Leather	1	40	320
Transportation	23	9,556	146,829
Public utilities	12	1,037	18,698
Municipal employment	6	531	1,954
Miscellaneous	13	1,198	9,879
Total	189	103,028	2,118,379

RECORD OF TRADE DISPUTES BY INDUSTRIES AND YEARS

Industry.	Year	Number of disputes	Employers involved	Employees involved	Time Loss in working days
Fishing	1901	2		8,000	135,000
	1902	1		50	
	1903	1		4,500	60,000
	1904	2	13	1,170	6,400
	1905				
	1906	1		180	540
	1907	1		125	1,500
	1908				
	1909	2	5	375	6,946
	1910				
	1911				
	1912	1	3	150	3,450
	1913	2	34	2,500	42,600
	1914				
	1915				
	1916				
	1917				
	1918				
To June 30	1919				
		53	55	16,727	255,986

RECORD OF TRADE DISPUTES BY INDUSTRIES AND YEARS

(Continued)

Industry.	Year	Number of disputes	Employers involved	Employees involved	Time loss in working days
Lumbering	1901	4	4	525	3,200
	1902	3	3	300	2,700
	1903	4	3	1,200	2,500
	1904	2	3	215	1,000
	1905	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1906	5	10	1,290	30,490
	1907	2	5	453	6,081
	1908	4	3	428	14,086
	1909	2	2	300	6,600
	1910	2	2	450	4,350
	1911	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1912	4	17	825	4,270
	1913	3	18	2,000	137,300
	1914	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1915	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1916	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1917	1	.....	800	6,400
	1918	2	.....	1,357	29,407
(To June 30)	1919	4	49	2,345	55,390
		42	119	12,888	304,344
Mines, smelters, quarries, clay products, etc.	1901	5	7	3,685	56,650
	1902	3	3	510	9,720
	1903	9	10	11,931	440,455
	1904	7	9	3,161	24,866
	1905	13	14	8,445	115,481
	1906	14	14	5,495	187,780
	1907	13	53	13,250	203,949
	1908	9	13	3,119	30,271
	1909	10	20	8,795	711,207
	1910	4	6	2,338	377,100
	1911	7	22	9,769	1,592,800
	1912	6	30	5,074	89,168
	1913	7	35	5,081	702,726
	1914	3	5	1,975	169,200
	1915	6	11	4,332	16,794
	1916	10	14	11,814	88,634
	1917	21	.....	18,729	633,600
	1918	36	.....	13,850	163,585
(To June 30)	1919	14	26	4,524	146,942
		197	292	136,877	5,760,928
Building and Construction	1901	14	108	2,533	62,793
	1902	31	258	3,557	30,827
	1903	44	653	8,783	357,563
	1904	30	461	6,041	124,693
	1905	24	248	1,766	34,710
	1906	29	716	8,454	69,472
	1907	44	494	5,278	185,063
	1908	12	94	1,561	20,957
	1909	13	288	2,580	47,100
	1910	25	1,143	9,446	151,436
	1911	29	248	8,828	286,804
	1912	52	585	8,465	114,224
	1913	31	661	7,312	105,510
	1914	12	140	1,745	34,056
	1915	4	21	157	16,600
	1916	7	42	210	4,124
	1917	19	.....	2,071	40,245
	1918	19	.....	1,912	18,453
To June 30)	1919	23	259	7,531	160,073
		462	6,419	88,230	1,854,703

RECORD OF TRADE DISPUTES BY INDUSTRIES AND YEARS

(Continued)

Industry	Year	Number of disputes	Employers involved	Employees involved	Time lost in working days
Metals, machinery & conveyances	1901	20	52	1,259	17,710
	1902	29	33	7,661	25,509
	1903	16	41	2,588	74,317
	1904	17	26	3,181	62,790
	1905	14	36	1,509	19,442
	1906	23	147	2,515	20,821
	1907	23	115	2,282	92,113
	1908	9	15	960	11,867
	1909	5	17	499	26,861
	1910	15	75	2,081	50,917
	1911	18	56	4,167	92,493
	1912	29	110	2,687	92,525
	1913	20	106	4,084	19,479
	1914	14	14	985	14,573
	1915	13	15	2,942	67,812
	1916	15	44	2,985	32,133
	1917	38	.....	6,859	94,801
	1918	45	.....	22,990	229,274
(To June 30)	1919	55	83	61,163	1,366,756
		426	982	136,294	2,338,702
Woodworking	1901	6	21	1,141	17,346
	1902	7	25	606	14,425
	1903	15	28	1,014	16,369
	1904	3	3	142	1,831
	1905	2	3	152	5,742
	1906	6	20	915	5,491
	1907	3	7	255	6,491
	1908	1	1	17	1,926
	1909	2	9	56	744
	1910	2	2	140	600
	1911	2	2	60	557
	1912	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1913	3	47	550	30,020
	1914	1	1	80	800
	1915	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1916	1	1	375	1,875
	1917	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1918	3	.....	408	3,432
(To June 30)	1919	3	4	320	5,400
		60	176	6,151	117,369
Printing and allied trades	1901	2	2	24	108
	1902	3	3	20	15
	1903	3	23	324	1,231
	1904	4	12	277	.....
	1905	6	44	446	8,236
	1906	6	18	197	3,858
	1907	2	9	58	288
	1908	1	1	40	360
	1909	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1910	1	3	40	280
	1911	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1912	3	32	308	3,70
	1913	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1914	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1915	1	10	21	903
	1916	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1917	2	.....	840	7,260
	1918	10	.....	2,455	21,580
To June 30	1919	8	18	1,292	20,194
		52	176	6,242	76,375

RECORD OF TRADE DISPUTES BY INDUSTRIES AND YEARS

(Continued)

Industry.	Year	Number of disputes	Employers involved	Employees involved	Time loss in working days
Clothing	1901	10	32	615	2,203
	1902	8	24	163	392
	1903	11	63	6,754	173,560
	1904	11	21	291	1,964
	1905	11	60	1,145	18,678
	1906	9	15	560	2,465
	1907	17	29	2,278	33,055
	1908	8	12	950	17,058
	1909	11	14	736	12,538
	1910	11	36	1,552	40,415
	1911	13	13	1,285	11,770
	1912	19	63	6,738	306,107
	1913	10	56	9,726	107,052
	1914	5	19	3,525	160,270
	1915	4	5	180	2,540
	1916	11	11	1,176	19,341
	1917	12	.....	6,983	271,387
	1918	9	.....	984	14,156
(To June 30)	1919	14	56	3,919	46,876
		204	529	49,560	1,241,827
Textile	1901	5	5	2,836	23,232
	1902	1	1	6	.....
	1903	5	4	1,346	17,671
	1904	3	3	134	1,044
	1905	1	1	134	804
	1906	5	6	2,234	15,124
	1907	6	6	3,397	31,357
	1908	6	8	7,542	135,972
	1909	2	2	948	33,380
	1910	2	2	315	20,950
	1911	4	4	943	18,123
	1912	1	1	106	1,166
	1913	3	3	1,379	7,351
	1914	1	1	50	450
	1915	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1916	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1917	3	.....	132	652
	1918	5	.....	337	16,611
(To June 30)	1919	5	5	3,745	51,301
		58	52	25,604	375,188
Food, liquors and tobacco	1901	10	19	746	933
	1902	10	20	310	3,066
	1903	6	28	280	2,609
	1904	11	14	666	8,434
	1905	4	13	151	1,106
	1906	8	20	257	1,784
	1907	2	1	47	1,128
	1908	1	1	53	1,328
	1909	2	5	75	3,895
	1910	8	46	698	7,626
	1911	3	18	213	373
	1912	2	8	72	2,382
	1913	5	16	750	14,420
	1914	2	2	53	10,120
	1915	3	11	88	4,427
	1916	7	19	1,201	22,977
	1917	12	.....	1,637	40,886
	1918	5	.....	1,271	61,869
(To June 30)	1919	11	89	5,244	38,973
		115	330	13,842	228,389

RECORD OF TRADE DISPUTES BY INDUSTRIES AND TRADES

(Continued)

Industry	Year	Number of disputes	Employees involved	Employees implicated	Time lost in working days
Leather	1901	1	9	36	72
	1902	2	3	85	188
	1903	4	5	175	1,264
	1904	1	2	25	232
	1905				
	1906	1	3	79	2,106
	1907	5	27	316	1,421
	1908				
	1909	2	7	81	5,231
	1910	1	4	72	2,664
	1911	1	1	15	210
	1912				
	1913				
	1914	2	5	65	2,570
	1915				
	1916				
	1917				
	1918	1		40	400
(To June 30)	1919	1	1	40	320
		25	61	1,082	20,120
Transportation	1901	11	9	2,496	215,896
	1902	10	17	2,235	10,120
	1903	15	46	2,311	69,141
	1904	2	2	103	3,505
	1905	5	9	1,415	6,073
	1906	16	17	2,175	15,687
	1907	17	54	3,837	40,313
	1908	7	65	6,462	421,172
	1909	7	17	1,506	11,089
	1910	7	6	3,620	90,414
	1911	12	195	4,667	53,466
	1912	14	20	4,535	42,069
	1913	8	11	1,917	24,096
	1914	1	1	440	880
	1915	4	8	1,140	10,860
	1916	10	33	2,340	27,288
	1917	24		6,710	81,000
	1918	30		15,842	134,744
(To June 30)	1919	20	68	2,956	145,970
		202	443	98,441	1,547,979
Miscellaneous	1901	3	3	105	735
	1902	6	23	1,788	29,077
	1903	4	10	297	1,371
	1904	2	2	296	3,404
	1905	7	7	1,104	2,562
	1906	5	19	95	428
	1907	7	25	584	12,427
	1908	2	2	413	3,641
	1909	2	2	112	1,120
	1910	1	1	20	42
	1911	6	6	632	12,337
	1912	10	10	389	4,228
	1913	5	18	896	8,480
	1914	4	20	332	1,667
	1915	7	14	389	4,262
	1916	2	104	320	3,265
	1917	5		174	1,929
	1918	12		1,322	10,805
(To June 30)	1919	10	109	1,108	9,870
		100	376	9,359	142,583

RECORD OF TRADE DISPUTES BY INDUSTRIES AND YEARS

(Continued)

Province.	Year	Number of disputes	Employers involved	Employees involved	Time loss in working days
Unskilled labour	1901	11	10	735	1,481
	1902	7	7	472	1,708
	1903	9	8	2,295	14,830
	1904	4	4	280	520
	1905	2	2	60	80
	1906	11	10	601	3,131
	1907	7	7	2,053	5,550
	1908	8	9	1,695	3,840
	1909	9	9	1,293	4,799
	1910	5	7	348	2,082
	1911	4	6	425	6,330
	1912	9	20	11,138	449,238
	1913	7	7	3,541	20,382
	1914	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1915	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1916	3	3	805	7,660
	1917a	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1918a	.....	.....	.....	.....
(To June 30)	1919a	.....	.....	.....	.....
		96	109	25,741	521,631

(a) Since 1917 the group "Unskilled Labour" has been eliminated from the classification and the different strikes affecting this group are carried along in the industries to which they relate.

Railway, canal and harbour construction	1917a	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1918	.....	.....	.....	.....
(To June 30)	1919	3	3	685	48,358
		3	3	685	48,358

(a) Previous to 1917 this group was not included in the classification of strikes by itself but was included in "Building and Construction."

Chemicals and explosives	1917a	1	.....	300	3,900
	1918	1	.....	170	2,040
(To June 30)	1919	2	2	96	951
		4	2	566	6,891

(a) Previous to 1917 strikes occurring in this group were possibly placed under "Miscellaneous."

Public Utilities	1917a	7	.....	807	7,408
	1918	5	.....	3,091	28,608
(To June 30)	1919	10	10	1,657	18,698
		22	10	5,555	54,714

(a) Previous to 1917 strikes occurring in this group were carried under the heading of "Miscellaneous Skilled Trades."

Municipal employment	1917a	3	.....	689	5,281
	1918	7	.....	3,861	28,064
(To June 30)	1919	6	6	531	1,954
		16	6	5,081	35,299

(a) Previous to 1917 strikes occurring in this group were carried under the heading of "Miscellaneous Skilled Trades."

SUMMARY OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY PROVINCES, 1901-1919.

Province.	Number of disputes	Employees involved	Time loss in working days
Nova Scotia	124	64,331	1,707,817
Prince Edward Island	5	335	1,865
New Brunswick	85	15,436	318,971
Quebec	411	134,309	2,095,756
Ontario	924	149,884	2,465,171
Manitoba	128	53,120	1,274,614
Saskatchewan	55	5,672	64,139
Alberta	144	37,203	956,529
British Columbia	230	122,377	3,449,531
Interprovincial	21	37,558	2,593,932
Total	2,127	620,835	14,937,239

TABLE OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY PROVINCES, JANUARY 1, 1919, TO JUNE 30, 1919.

Province.	Number of disputes	Employees involved	Time loss in working days
Nova Scotia	10	3,761	136,136
New Brunswick	8	1,030	27,901
Quebec	47	26,300	321,922
Ontario	72	25,928	300,305
Manitoba	8	25,299	934,158
Saskatchewan	9	1,816	45,729
Alberta	11	7,164	165,194
British Columbia	24	10,728	187,421
Total	189	105,026	2,118,879

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY PROVINCES, 1901 TO JUNE 30, 1919.

Province	Year	Number of disputes	Employers involved	Employees involved	Time loss in working days
Nova Scotia	1901	5	34	2,624	28,215
	1902	9	88	1,769	12,962
	1903	6	39	2,685	10,770
	1904	9	9	4,339	71,194
	1905	7	6	5,815	33,562
	1906	11	9	4,815	31,560
	1907	10	19	6,134	140,725
	1908	3	9	377	2,806
	1909	6	9	5,930	522,062
	1910	4	17	1,903	361,615
	1911	3	2	1,154	193,230
	1912	4	24	104	1,790
	1913	4	56	1,015	18,324
	1914	4	18	188	10,683
	1915	8	14	3,821	24,025
	1916	2	2	1,388	22,996
	1917	7	.....	1,415	9,173
	1918	13	.....	15,094	75,189
(To June 30)	1919	10	9	3,761	136,136
		124	364	64,331	1,707,017
Prince Edward Island	1901	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1902	2	2	47	819
	1903	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1904	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1905	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1906	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1907	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1908	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1909	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1910	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1911	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1912	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1913	1	1	18	36
	1914	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1915	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1916	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1917	2	.....	270	1,010
	1918	.....	.....	.....	.....
(To June 30)	1919	.....	.....	.....	.....
		5	3	335	1,865
New Brunswick	1901	3	6	124	639
	1902	7	6	382	5,993
	1903	3	3	901	16,741
	1904	2	5	11	.....
	1905	5	10	1,925	22,620
	1906	9	49	823	6,948
	1907	8	15	1,480	13,462
	1908	6	19	1,485	29,935
	1909	2	2	65	2,515
	1910	1	1	150	1,050
	1911	3	7	134	406
	1912	7	17	872	13,274
	1913	8	33	2,362	154,136
	1914	2	2	230	2,780
	1915	1	2	100	600
	1916	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1917	2	.....	77	2,366
	1918	8	.....	2,385	17,909
(To June 30)	1919	8	14	1,030	27,601
		85	191	15,436	318,975

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY PROVINCES, 1901 TO JUNE 30, 1919

(Continued)

Province	Year	Number of disputes	Employees involved	Employees involved	Time lost in working days
Quebec	1901	28	35	3,749	39,814
	1902	20	102	3,318	18,445
	1903	41	230	15,744	251,078
	1904	31	311	3,335	53,142
	1905	21	157	3,130	44,145
	1906	24	86	3,216	48,408
	1907	30	102	7,570	76,105
	1908	21	52	9,982	165,869
	1909	13	39	2,264	31,902
	1910	18	569	7,207	100,504
	1911	19	57	6,745	62,770
	1912	24	109	6,810	101,059
	1913	18	63	9,790	63,731
	1914	9	23	4,864	167,277
	1915	3	9	2,758	13,302
	1916	13	117	3,998	32,770
	1917	24	.....	6,805	260,052
	1918	15	.....	2,852	60,891
(To June 30)	1919	47	.....	26,880	321,042
		411	2,021	134,389	2,087,746
Ontario	1901	54	188	3,923	52,546
	1902	66	180	3,714	69,244
	1903	70	470	14,028	420,840
	1904	46	235	6,082	120,170
	1905	63	450	7,011	84,666
	1906	31	134	3,113	36,711
	1907	74	444	13,219	264,799
	1908	27	74	2,072	42,206
	1909	26	116	3,589	38,099
	1910	34	500	5,794	191,646
	1911	41	167	4,866	71,243
	1912	67	498	10,849	270,249
	1913	51	519	14,883	239,078
	1914	20	79	1,999	72,158
	1915	16	84	1,723	34,711
	1916	33	193	4,979	67,090
	1917	54	.....	9,597	65,145
	1918	71	.....	17,867	358,734
(To June 30)	1919	72	.....	28,928	337,309
		924	4,111	165,884	2,495,173
[illegible]	1901	3	2	472	17,744
	1902	8	22	400	2,272
	1903	2	90	900	8,250
	1904	4	5	55	495
	1905	11	61	563	1,559
	1906	9	344	3,055	86,750
	1907	6	95	1,307	26,800
	1908	1	1	10	48
	1909	6	93	1,548	26,070
	1910	7	53	1,051	14,472
	1911	8	54	809	1,165
	1912	7	123	3,046	26,450
	1913	5	118	1,138	15,651
	1914	2	66	184	4,319
	1915	4	14	307	420
	1916	7	14	775	10,581
	1917	12	.....	2,051	47,200
	1918	18	.....	4,552	51,449
(To June 30)	1919	8	8	21,200	504,510
		128	1,099	51,530	1,354,111

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY PROVINCES, 1901 TO JUNE 30, 1919.

(*Continued*)

Province	Year	Number of disputes	Employers involved	Employees involved	Time loss in working days
Saskatchewan	1901	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1902	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1903	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1904	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1905	1	1	20	.....
	1906	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1907	1	5	40	360
	1908	1	2	200	800
	1909	1	1	162	486
	1910	8	43	297	10,622
	1911	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1912	16	149	1,885	11,116
	1913	4	36	188	3,569
	1914	1	4	12	70
	1915	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1916	6	.....	441	1,875
	1917	3	.....	153	1,130
	1918	8	.....	456	8,381
(To June 30)	1919	9	14	1,816	45,729
		55	255	5,672	84,138
Alberta	1901	.....	.....	.....	.....
	1902	1	13	90	1,080
	1903	4	30	183	3,990
	1904	1	3	28	112
	1905	2	2	500	13,000
	1906	12	48	1,491	127,709
	1907	5	22	678	2,556
	1908	3	3	569	8,599
	1909	5	125	873	48,416
	1910	6	91	730	13,882
	1911	12	45	1,668	8,545
	1912	14	127	3,345	76,837
	1913	6	107	1,369	13,051
	1914	4	9	1,077	17,167
	1915	6	14	355	4,108
	1916	4	7	494	8,974
	1917	17	.....	11,113	387,687
	1918	31	.....	5,076	55,711
(To June 30)	1919	11	11	7,164	165,104
		144	657	37,203	956,528
British Columbia	1901	10	6	10,194	190,249
	1902	8	7	524	9,122
	1903	21	59	15,600	512,433
	1904	8	15	1,199	5,150
	1905	10	64	3,157	43,720
	1906	13	29	1,657	71,276
	1907	13	115	3,102	59,584
	1908	5	14	2,092	8,022
	1909	8	14	719	18,605
	1910	7	67	1,008	21,454
	1911	12	196	8,221	312,791
	1912	10	43	12,520	490,726
	1913	15	81	9,560	756,202
	1914	2	4	1,175	155,675
	1915	5	9	896	26,513
	1916	10	13	9,835	48,615
	1917	27	.....	14,026	330,618
	1918	26	.....	16,164	201,355
(To June 30)	1919	24	.....	10,728	187,421
		230	735	122,377	3,449,531

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY PROVINCES, 1901 TO JUNE 30, 1919
(Continued)

Province	Year	Number of disputes	Employers involved	Employees involved	Time lost in working days
Interprovincial	1901	1	1	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1902				
	1903				
	1904	2	2	1,200	6,200
	1905	1	2	200	
	1906				
	1907	2	6	1,505	62,500
	1908	1	1	5,000	625,000
	1909	1	11	2,000	201,000
	1910	3	3	3,200	75,000
	1911	2	17	7,000	1,471,000
	1912	1	1	1,000	26,000
	1913	1	1	600	15,000
	1914				
	1915				
	1916				
	1917				
	1918	6		5,233	102,582
(To June 30)	1919				*
		21	47	37,558	2,593,682

STATEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY CAUSES AND RESULTS, 1901 TO JUNE 30, 1919

Cause or object.	Year.	In favour of employees.			In favour of employers.			Compromise.			Indefinite or Unterminated.			Total		
		No. of disputes	Employees involved.	Time loss in working days.	No. of disputes	Employees involved.	Time loss in working days.	No. of disputes	Employees involved.	Time loss in working days.	No. of disputes	Employees involved.	Time loss in working days.	No. of disputes	Employees involved.	Time loss in working days.
Wages:—																
For increased wages	1901 to June 30, 1919.	352	101,381	1,493,036	219	56,911	1,748,084	153	35,034	451,468	102	18,419	297,973	826	211,745	3,991,161
For increased wages and shorter hours	1901 to June 30, 1919	72	13,469	206,542	25	3,960	62,089	23	6,451	131,103	16	6,401	202,403	136	30,281	602,144
For increased wages and other changes.	1901 to June 30, 1919.	128	63,387	747,131	42	5,656	207,122	45	25,705	1,942,557	33	10,873	304,827	248	106,621	3,201,637
Against a reduction in wages	1901 to June 30, 1919.	35	6,645	132,553	46	15,238	299,653	13	1,833	11,938	36	9,487	299,174	130	33,203	743,318
Hours:—																
For shorter hours	1901 to June 30, 1919.	37	6,608	151,827	41	5,336	142,462	12	2,331	20,299	13	1,555	21,517	103	15,830	336,105
Mainly affecting Unionism:—																
For recognition of union	1901 to June 30, 1919.	21	19,434	390,681	22	1,929	348,696	7	3,635	194,405	20	11,152	1,473,108	70	39,154	2,406,870

STATEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY CAUSES AND RESULTS, 1901 TO JUNE 30, 1919.

Cause or object.	Year.	In favour of employees.			In favour of employers.			Compromise.			Indefinite or Unascertained.			Total.		
		No. of disputes	Employees involved	Time lost in working days.	No. of disputes	Employees involved	Time lost in working days	No. of disputes	Employees involved	Time lost in working days.	No. of disputes	Employees involved	Time lost in working days.	No. of disputes	Employees involved	Time lost in working days.
Against employment of non-unionists	1901 to June 30, 1919	20	10,522	102,053	13	4,029	96,542	3	3,040	117,080	30	5,237	25,115	66	22,828	340,820
Against discharge of employees	1901 to June 30, 1919	53	8,663	84,219	96	6,316	210,899	4	465	5,152	17	6,299	127,215	170	21,683	418,477
Against employment of particular persons	1901 to June 30, 1919	24	4,819	27,038	34	4,385	72,667	7	1,049	24,057	14	413	1,446	79	9,663	95,208
Sympathetic	1901 to June 30, 1919	19	1,967	37,450	35	4,141	1,176,752	3	1,839	21,989	11	7,463	242,329	68	66,192	1,478,520
Unclassified—	1901 to June 30, 1919	97	10,267	126,642	55	13,995	867,280	26	12,685	273,745	74	16,091	301,241	249	62,938	1,568,908
TOTAL	1901 to June 30, 1919	942	281,552	3,536,151	621	189,540	4,992,827	293	93,079	3,194,511	364	94,283	3,311,649	2,137	658,215	14,937,279

STATEMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES BY CAUSES AND RESULTS, JANUARY 1, 1919, TO JUNE 30, 191

Cause or object.	In favour of employees.			In favour of employers.			Compromise.			Indefinite or unterminated.			Total		
	No. of disputes	Employees involved.	Time loss in working days.	No. of disputes	Employees involved.	Time loss in working days.	No. of disputes.	Employees involved	Time loss in working days.	No. of disputes	Employees involved.	Time loss in working days.	No. of disputes	Employees involved	Time loss in working days
Wages:—															
For increased wages	30	4,498	102,585	11	1,601	50,150	1	350	4,550	3	232	5,292	45	6,681	162,586
*For increased wages and shorter hours	...	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	..	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	...	.....	.....
For increased wages and other changes	55	30,069	419,030	12	865	14,589	7	3,677	39,210	16	6,758	172,265	90	41,369	645,094
Against a reduction in wages	3	1,472	40,126	2	27	63	..	.....	.....	2	2,152	75,860	7	3,651	116,049
Hours:—															
For shorter hours	4	658	8,309	..	.....	.....	1	84	927	1	137	3,973	6	879	13,209
Mainly affecting unionism															
For recognition of union	3	1,312	9,561	2	882	4,656	..	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	5	2,194	14,217
Against employment of non-unionists	1	59	265	...	.....	.....	..	.....	.....	..	.....	.....	1	59	265
Against discharge of employees	3	556	2,004	3	199	1,850	1	170	1,530	...	.....	.....	7	925	6,074
Against employment of particular persons	...	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	..	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	...	.....	.....
Sympathetic	1	37	1,221	16	46,565	1,096,530	..	.....	.....	...	.....	.....	17	46,602	1,097,751
Unclassified	4	770	54,852	4	186	1,502	1	1,300	3,900	2	410	2,860	11	2,666	63,114
TOTAL	104	39,431	638,643	50	50,325	1,169,369	11	5,581	50 117	24	9,689	260,250	189	105,026	2,118,379

*Included in "For increased wages and other changes."

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES LEGISLATION

Dominion Laws.

Canadian legislation relative to industrial disputes comprises two laws of the Dominion Parliament and various enactments of the Provincial Legislatures.

The two statutes of the Dominion Parliament referred to are: (1) the *Conciliation and Labour Act*, Chap. 96, R. S. Can., 1906 and (2) the *Industrial Disputes Investigation Act*, Chap. 20, 1907, amended by Chap. 29, 1910, and Chap. 27, 1918.

Conciliation and Labour Act.

The *Conciliation and Labour Act* contains the earliest Dominion legislation concerning industrial disputes. This statute, in its present form, is a consolidation dating from 1906 of two earlier laws, the *Conciliation Act* and the *Railway Disputes Act*. The Conciliation Act was passed in 1900. It provided for the appointment of a Minister of Labour and for the establishment of a Department of Labour with certain prescribed functions and for the institution under the supervision of the Minister of a system of Conciliation Boards for the adjustment of industrial disputes. The statute, in so far as it related to Conciliation Boards and industrial disputes, proceeded generally on the lines of an English Act. No Boards of this nature have, however, been established under its provisions. Nevertheless, the Act has not been fruitless in its bearing on industrial disputes, as the Department of Labour, under its authority, has been enabled to follow closely the course of industrial disputes, not only for statistical purposes, but from the point of view of public welfare, and to assist in their settlement through the agency of mediation.

In 1903 was enacted the *Railway Disputes Act*, a measure applying, as its name suggests, to disputes in industries affecting the railway service. The new statute invested the Minister with a limited power of compulsion with respect to the establishment of Conciliation Boards. Where a dispute existed between a railway company and its employees, and either party to the dispute (or a municipality concerned therein) asked that the dispute might be referred to a Board for adjustment, the Act permitted the establishment of a Board without requiring the consent of the other disputant. If, however, the establishment of a Board was not requested, no Board could be established, and in any event the statute placed no restraint on the right to strike or lockout. This measure remained, on the whole, inactive, only one dispute being referred for adjustment under its provisions down to 1907, when it was practically displaced by new legislation.

In 1906 the two measures mentioned were consolidated in the Revised Statutes of Canada and became known as the *Conciliation and Labour Act*.

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.

The year 1907 saw the enactment of the *Industrial Disputes Investigation Act*, the scope of which is indicated by its complete title, "An Act to aid in the Prevention and Settlement of Strikes and Lockouts in Mines and Industries connected with Public Utilities." The process of dealing with a dispute under this Act entails its reference for attempted adjustment to a Board of Conciliation and

Investigation formed on the lines of the ordinary board of arbitration, with a nominee from each of the disputants and a third member to be chairman, selected if possible by joint agreement, or failing joint agreement, named by the Minister of Labour. A strike or lockout in the industries to which the law applies is unlawful, under penalty, until the dispute in question has been referred to a Board of Conciliation and Investigation, and until the Board has reported.

The Act gives the Board powers for taking evidence, etc. Proceedings are public or private as may seem expedient to the Board. The Department pays fees and travelling expenses of Board members, witnesses, etc., and for necessary clerical work. If the Board by conciliatory effort brings the disputants together and a working agreement results, the dispute manifestly is ended. If this is impossible, the Board is required to make findings and recommendations showing how in its view a settlement should be made. Once the Board's findings are made public, the disputants, unless they have voluntarily bound themselves before the Board by agreement, are freed from the restraining effect of the statute and the threatened strike or lockout may proceed. Penalties are named for those taking part in strikes or lockouts contrary to the terms of the Act, also for persons who incite, encourage or aid those taking part in such strikes or lockouts. Clause 57 of the Act aims also at preventing changes in conditions with respect to wages or hours save by mutual consent or until the proposed changes have been before a Board.

Apart from the direct bearing of the Act on disputes in industries connected with mines and public utilities, its machinery is, by sec. 63, made available for industrial disputes in other industries, the consent of each disputant being, however, necessary where the dispute lies outside the stated industries.

Provincial Laws

Nova Scotia.

The Miners' Arbitration Act, (R.S., 1900, cap. 21), was passed in 1890. Under its provisions any dispute between miners and employers may be referred to the Commissioner of Public Works and Mines, by either party, and in such case no strike or lockout is to take place until the matter is determined by a Board of Arbitrators. The Board consists of five persons, one appointed by each of the parties to the dispute, a third by the two thus chosen, and the remaining two by the Governor-in-Council. The award made by the Board may be made an order of the Supreme Court on the motion of either party.

The Conciliation Act, 1903, (cap. 37), provides for the formation of Boards of Conciliation consisting of six persons representing equally the two parties to the dispute, with power to decide all questions arising between the employer and workmen concerned. If both parties so desire, an arbitrator may be appointed by the Provincial Secretary.

If in any district or trade, adequate means do not exist for having disputes submitted to a Conciliation Board for the district or trade, the Provincial Secretary may appoint any person or persons to inquire into the conditions of the district or trade, and confer with the employers and employed, and, if desirable, with any local authority or body, as to the expediency of establishing a Conciliation Board for the district or trade.

Quebec.

The Quebec *Trade Disputes Act*, enacted in 1901, (R.S., 1909, Sections 2489 *et seq.*), is applicable only to disputes affecting not less than ten workmen in the same business.

A Registrar of Councils of Conciliation and Arbitration is to be appointed from among persons performing other duties in the public service. It is his duty to endeavour to act as mediator between the parties to the dispute. Provision is made for Councils of Conciliation, each Council consisting of four members, two appointed by each of the parties to the dispute. The Registrar may refer a dispute to such a Council on the application of either or both parties. In the event of failure to reach a settlement of the dispute, either party may require the Registrar to refer the dispute to the Council of Arbitration for settlement by award. The latter Council consists of three arbitrators, one appointed on the recommendation of each of the disputants and the third on the joint recommendation of the other two, or failing such action, the Minister of Public Works and Labour may appoint an impartial person to be president of the Council. The Council of Arbitration exists only until a report on the particular dispute has been made to the Minister.

A dispute may be referred directly to a Council of Arbitration without being brought before a Council of Conciliation. An award must be made within one year after the Council has completed its hearing of the references. Full power to summon witnesses, etc., is granted to the Councils of Conciliation and Arbitration.

ONTARIO.

The Trade Disputes Act, 1910, (R.S.O., cap. 145), provides means of conciliation or arbitration in cases of disputes affecting not less than ten employees. The Act provides for the appointment of a Registrar of Councils of Conciliation and of Arbitration to visit the locality of any dispute when requested to do so by any of the parties concerned, and to mediate between employer and employed.

Application for a Council of Conciliation may be made by either or both parties to the dispute, the Council consisting of four members, two to be nominated by each party.

In case of failure to reach a settlement of the claim or dispute by conciliation, either party may require the Registrar to refer the claim or dispute to a Council of Arbitration. A clear distinction is made between disputes between railway companies, including street railway companies, and their employees, and any other disputes. There are, therefore, two Councils of Arbitration provided for, each of three members, one nominated by each of the parties, and the third, who may act as President of both Councils, to be appointed on the joint nomination of the other members. Failing such joint action, the appointment may be made by the Lieutenant Governor. Members hold office for two years, but are eligible for re-appointment. Every employer of ten persons in Ontario is entitled to one vote, and every Board of Trade in Ontario is entitled to one vote for the member of the Council of Arbitration to represent the employing interests. In the case of employees other than those of railway companies, every Trades and Labour Council, every Federated Council of Building Trades, and every Trade Union is entitled to one vote for the member of the Council of Arbitration to represent the wage earners. Some responsibility for prompt action in the case of a dispute is cast on the Mayor of the city or town, it being his duty to notify the Registrar at once of the nature of the dispute, and the parties affected by it.

Section 60 of *the Ontario Railway Municipal Board Act, 1911*, provides that a dispute between a railway, street railway, or public utility company and its employees, may be submitted to the Board for its determination and settlement. Any request to the Board for such action must contain an agreement to abide by

the determination of the Board and to continue at work without a lockout or strike during the investigation.

Where the lockout or strike occurs and the general public is likely to suffer injury or inconvenience with respect to food, fuel, light, power, means of communication or transportation, or in any other respect, and the parties refuse to submit the dispute to the Board, the latter, after failing to conciliate the parties, may proceed of its own motion to investigate all the facts bearing on the case, and shall make public its findings with such recommendations to the parties as, in its judgment, will contribute to a fair and equitable settlement of their difference.

MANITOBA.

The Industrial Conditions Act, passed at the last session of the Provincial Legislature, provides for the appointment of a Joint Council of Industry of five persons, two as representatives of employers and two as representatives of employees, with an impartial chairman. Whenever a dispute has occurred or seems likely to arise, the Council is empowered to hold such investigation and make such report as seems just and reasonable.

Inquiries into the cost of living are to be made from time to time if deemed advisable by the Council, and a monthly report thereon may be published. Special investigations and reports are to be made in the case of an apparently unfair and unreasonable price. Investigations are also to be made into the rates of wages, labour market, and labour organization. Encouragement is to be given to the formation of organizations, and reports are to be published showing the results of the inquiries into the above matters.

Information is also to be obtained regarding the living conditions of wage earners generally, such as housing, sanitary conditions, education facilities and the advantage taken thereof, apprenticeship, opportunities for recreation and for making provision for the future of themselves and their dependents. Reports are to be made on any case in which large profits are being made by maintaining unfair rates of wages, in case of breach of contracts, or unfair discrimination by employer. Authority is granted the Council to recommend to the Legislature measures designed to better the conditions of employment and, specially, to bring to the attention of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council any unemployment, and to recommend measures aimed at its prevention. Full power to investigate any matters within its jurisdiction is conferred on the Council.

At the request of the parties to any industrial dispute, the Council shall act as a Board of Arbitration. The Council is empowered to declare any or all the rules of law maintained in Schedule A of this Act to be enforced and effective during such period as the Council may fix. Schedule A provides that no act in contemplation or furtherance of an industrial dispute is actionable only on the ground that two or more persons agreed or combined for the act. Neither is an act to be actionable in such case on the ground only that it induces some other person to break a contract of employment, or that it is an interference with the trade, business or employment of some other person, or with the right of some other person to dispose of his labour or his capital as he wills. Picketing is allowed if for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any persons to work or to abstain from work.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

The Labour Conciliation and Arbitration Act of British Columbia was enacted in 1894. (B.C., R.S., 1911, chap. 123.) It provides for the appointment

of the Provincial Secretary to act as Commissioner of Councils of Labour Conciliation and Arbitration, and for the appointment of a Deputy Commissioner. Only disputes affecting not less than fifteen employees are the subject of conciliation or arbitration under this Act.

Provision is made for the appointment of Councils of Conciliation consisting of four conciliators appointed upon the recommendation or nomination of the disputants, two by each party of the dispute. Application for a Council of Conciliation may be made by either party, but must be agreed to by both.

If a Council of Conciliation fails to bring about a settlement or adjustment of any dispute referred to it, application may then be made by both parties conjointly to the Council of Arbitration for settlement by award. The Council of Arbitration consists of three members, two nominated by the conciliators, one to represent each party to the dispute, and the third by a judge of the Supreme Court, appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor on the nomination, if such be made, of the two other members.

Application for a Council of Arbitration may be made directly, that is, without previous reference to the Council of Conciliation, each party nominating an arbitrator. If both parties agree to be bound by an award, the said award may be made a rule of the Supreme Court, on the application of either party.

"In many industries in Canada the eight-hour day has already been adopted, and it has been recognized by the Peace Treaty. We recommend that it be established by law throughout Canada, with due regard for the above consideration. Such legislation should provide for a weekly rest of at least twenty-four hours, which should include Sunday whenever practicable.

"Where a shorter day is now worked, the enactment of such legislation should in no way interfere with such practice or with its extension."

From the Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, 1919.

The Dominion Parliament has not enacted any legislation regarding hours of labour in Canada, but in its contracts for public works, etc., requires the observance of the prevailing hours of labour in the district in which the work is being enacted.

The legislative control of hours of labour in employment has been regarded as falling generally within the jurisdiction of the provinces and practically all of the provinces have enacted some legislation on the subject. The subject of hours of labour in employment has also been one of frequent discussion between employers and workmen. The situation at the present time is that in numerous industries an eight-hour day has been obtained by working agreements, whilst in some provinces an eight-hour day in certain industries has been established by law.

Adoption of Eight-Hour Day by Agreement

The working day in part is limited to eight hours under general agreement between employers and workers, or by custom in specified occupations of the following industrial groups: the building trades, the clerical and mercantile group, the personal service and amusement group, the general labour group, the chemical and oils industry, the food and tobacco industry, the metals group, the pulp and paper industry, the printing group, the textiles industry, the ships and vehicles group.

In the building trades, hours are regulated largely by agreement. There is the greatest diversity in both agreement and custom. In some cases the various building trades of an entire city work on an eight-hour day basis. In other cases it may apply to only part of these trades in the city, *e.g.*, painters, and electrical workers in Calgary. Where all these trades work an eight-hour day in one city, it may be in accordance with an agreement between the local Building Trades Council and the local Builders' Association. But the great majority of building trades workers in Canada who work an eight-hour day do so in accordance with an agreement between the local unions and local employers. In very few cases is the eight-hour day established as a matter of custom only. The eight-hour day, where applied, sometimes affects all classes of labour in this group, but usually is confined to classes having, in any particular city, a well organized union. The result is an absolute lack of uniformity; in one city the painters, carpenters and masons alone may be working on this basis; in another city, plumbers, bricklayers and stonecutters may be the only classes. There is a tendency to make an exception in the case of builders' labourers and steam engineers, whose work often require longer hours. The present tendency, however, appears to be toward uniformity between the various building trades in any one city.

In clerical and mercantile work the eight-hour day is only occasional, though there appears to be a strong movement at present toward shortening hours by early closing of shops. In this group it is a matter almost wholly of custom. Some notable examples of the eight-hour practice exist in retail trade; on the whole, however, the eight-hour day applies to but a small number of the workers of this class.

In the personal service and amusement group, diversity occurs, due to the fact that where these workers are organized the eight-hour day by agreement is fairly prevalent, but, where unorganized, the reverse is true; in other words, there is some practice of the eight-hour day by agreement, but very little by custom. As organization is not extensive in this group, except in the case of theatrical employees, it follows that not a very large proportion of the workers are on this basis. The principal occupations other than theatrical employees (including moving-picture operators) which have the eight-hour day by agreement are those of hotel and restaurant employees.

General labourers, with the exception of municipal labour in a few cities, almost invariably work in excess of an eight-hour day. Even in the case of eight-hour civic labour, teamsters usually work nine hours per day. The tendency toward a short day for labourers is more marked in the western provinces.

In the chemicals and oils group there are only occasional applications of the eight-hour day. This industry is comparatively small.

In the food and tobacco group the eight hour day is occasional. With tobacco workers, where these are organized, it is fairly well known. Very few workers in breweries have it. It is more common in certain food industries, such as cereals.

In the metals group, the majority of workers in machine shops, who are well organized, work an eight-hour day by agreement. A good example is that of the Ontario Provincial Association of Machinists, which drafts hour and wage schedules for all local branches within the province. In the case of blacksmiths, boilermakers, moulders, sheet metal workers and patternmakers, the eight-hour day is not usual, except in western cities. In steel plants also it is unusual, although there are notable exceptions in this respect.

In the pulp and paper industry there appears to be a strong tendency toward adopting the eight-hour day by agreement.

Workers in the printing trades, who are strongly organized, almost invariably work on an eight-hour basis by agreement. Perhaps the only exceptions are to be found in certain less skilled branches of the bookbinding trades where female labour is employed. Included in this group are the bank-note companies, who also work an eight-hour day.

In clothing and textiles, some diversity occurs; garment workers enjoy the eight-hour day to some extent, but tailors, rarely. In this connection should be noted the prevalence of piece work. In textile mills the eight-hour day is practically unknown.

In the shipbuilding industries, the eight-hour day does not prevail, with the notable exception of the yards at Victoria and Vancouver. In the vehicle industries diversity occurs.

The mining industry is covered in part by legislation enforcing an eight-hour day and in part by agreement. The mining group as a whole may be said to be largely eight-hour. In smelters, the eight-hour day is not usual.

Railway operation in Canada follows in general the regulations laid down in the United States by the McAdoo Award, which stipulates a basic eight-hour

day. In applying to Canadian railways, Supplement 7 of the Award, the Canadian Railway War Board announced that the working hours of the day were to be limited to eight consecutive hours, exclusive of the meal hour, when and where practicable. In electric street railways the eight-hour day is general only in British Columbia.

In some cities, civic regulations affecting large numbers of workers in many different occupations, require an eight-hour day. Occasionally most of the trades in a single city may be eight-hour day. Certain large public utilities have adopted the eight-hour day. Light, heat and power companies, where privately owned, usually have an eight-hour day by agreement, especially in the case of electrical workers. Two railway express companies have an eight-hour day by agreement with their employees.

Provincial Legislation Relating to Hours of Labour

Various statutes bearing on hours of labour in employment have been enacted in the different provinces.

In the mining industry the limit of eight hours a day or forty-eight hours a week is already enforced by law in Alberta, British Columbia, Ontario, Quebec and the Yukon Territory.

In the manufacturing industry the limit of eight hours a day or forty-eight hours a week is already enforced by law in British Columbia and Nova Scotia, and by administrative orders in the province of Manitoba.

In the mercantile industry the limit of eight hours a day or forty-eight hours a week is already enforced by law in the province of Nova Scotia and by law and administrative orders in the province of Manitoba.

On public works the limit of eight hours a day or forty-eight hours a week is already enforced by law in the Yukon Territory and by administrative order in the province of Manitoba.

In restaurants the limit of forty-eight hours a week is already enforced by administrative order in the province of Manitoba.

Following is a summary of the provincial laws relating to hours of labour:

ALBERTA.

Mines: No workman shall be employed below ground in any mine for more than 8 hours during any consecutive 24 hours, except in cases of accident or other emergency.

Factories, Shops and Offices: No person working day shift shall be employed in any factory in the province, or in any shop, office or office building in a city or town of over 5,000 inhabitants, earlier than 7 a.m. or later than 6 p.m., and every such employee shall be allowed one hour for lunch. The hours of labour for persons working night shift shall not exceed eight hours. No person shall work more than one shift in one day, but the inspector may, for special reasons, permit longer hours on either shift.

After May 19, 1919, the chief inspector in any city or town of over 5,000 inhabitants, upon the recommendation of a local advisory committee appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council and representing employers and employees, may make regulations respecting the hours of labour per day or per week in any local factory, shop, office or office building; provided that no such regulation shall allow a greater number of hours of labour per week than is allowed by *the Factory Act*.

Municipalities are empowered to pass by-laws under certain conditions respecting early closing hours in shops.

British Columbia.

Mines, Smelters, Etc.: Prior to April 1, 1919, the eight-hour working day was in force for underground workers at coal mines, for underground workers and stationary engineers at metalliferous mines, and for workers in or about smelters. On April 1, three amending acts went into force extending the eight-hour day to workers above ground at any coal or metalliferous mine, and at, in or about any coke-oven, concentrator or mineral separation plant.

Factories and Shops: The hours of labour for female employees in any factory shall not exceed 8 hours per day or 48 hours per week, except under special permit from the Inspector, and in such cases the hours shall not exceed 9 hours per day or 54 per week. Young persons shall not be employed in any shop for more than 11 hours per day or 13 hours on Saturday, including meal time, or 60½ hours per week. No person shall be employed in any bakeshop for more than 12 hours per day or 60 hours per week, except by special permission of the Inspector.

Every person employed in any shop (except bakeries, cigar stands, drug stores, etc.) shall be given one afternoon half-holiday per week.

Municipalities are empowered to pass by-laws under certain conditions respecting early closing hours in shops.

The powers of the Minimum Wage Board, created by *the Minimum Wage Act of 1918*, were extended at the recent session of the British Columbia legislature so that the Board is now empowered to fix maximum hours as well as minimum wages for female employees in factories, shops, etc.

Manitoba.

Factories, Shops and Offices: The hours of labour for young girls, boys or women in any factory shall not exceed 9 hours per day or 54 hours per week, except under special permit from the Inspector, and in such cases the hours shall not exceed 12 hours per day or 60 hours per week. Women and young persons shall not be employed in shops or offices for more than 14 hours per day or 60 hours per week, except in cases of emergency when the weekly limit for such workers may be increased to 70 hours. No person shall be employed in any bakeshop for more than 12 hours per day or 60 hours per week.

The Minimum Wage Board, created by *the Minimum Wage Act of 1918*, has power to fix maximum hours as well as minimum wages for female employees in mail order houses, shops, factories, offices and places of amusement. The Board has issued 35 sets of regulations affecting employees in laundries, abattoirs, box factories, retail stores, etc. These regulations fix a nine-hour day for all the establishments affected, except departmental and standard retail stores and millinery establishments, for which 8½ hours per day is fixed as the maximum. The maximum hours of labour per week fixed by the regulations vary from 45 to 52 hours.

New Brunswick.

Factories and Shops: Young girls and women shall not be employed in any factory for more than 10 hours per day or 60 hours per week, except under special permit from the Inspector, and in such cases the hours shall not exceed 13½ hours per day and 81 hours per week.

Municipalities are empowered to pass by-laws under certain conditions respecting early closing hours in shops.

NOVA SCOTIA.

Mines: Boys between the ages of twelve and sixteen years shall not be employed at coal or metalliferous mines for more than 10 hours per day or 50 hours per week, except in cases of accident or emergency.

Factories and Shops: No boy or girl under 16 years of age shall be employed in a factory for more than 8 hours a day and 4 hours on Saturday, nor shall any young girl between the ages of 16 and 18 years be employed for more than 9 hours per day. Young persons shall not be employed in shops for a longer period than 8 hours per day and 4 hours on Saturday.

Municipalities are empowered to pass by-laws under certain conditions respecting early closing hours in shops.

Railways: Motormen and conductors on street railways shall not be employed for more than 6 hours on Sunday or 10 hours on any week day, except to enable them to complete a run or in cases of emergency.

ONTARIO.

Mines: No workman shall be employed underground in any mine for more than 8 hours in any consecutive 24 hours, except in cases of emergency; provided that a Saturday shift may work longer hours for the purpose of changing shift, avoiding Sunday labour or giving any of the men a part holiday.

Factories and Shops: No child, young person or woman shall be employed in a factory or shop for more than 10 hours per day or 60 hours per week, except on Saturdays and days preceding statutory holidays when shop employees may be employed between the hours of 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. In cases of emergency the Inspector may permit longer working hours for women and young persons, but such hours must not exceed 12½ per day and 72½ per week. No person shall be employed in a bakeshop for more than 12 hours per day or 60 hours per week, except under special permit from the Inspector.

Municipalities are empowered to pass by-laws under certain conditions respecting the early closing hours in shops.

Railways: No railway employees shall be required or permitted to work for more than 6 days of 10 hours each in any one week, and no conductor, engineer, motorman, foreman, trainman, despatcher or signal man who has worked in any capacity for 16 consecutive hours shall be required or permitted to go on duty again without at least 6 hours' rest. The Ontario Railway and Municipal Board is empowered to regulate the hours of labour for street railway conductors and motormen, but in no case shall an employee work more than 6 days of 10 hours each in any one week.

QUEBEC.

Mines: No boy between 15 and 17 years of age shall be employed underground in any mine for more than 48 hours per week.

Factories and Shops: No boy under 18 years of age and no girl or woman shall be employed in an industrial establishment for more than 10 hours per day and 60 hours per week, except in cotton or woollen factories where the maximum weekly hours shall not exceed 55 hours. In cases of emergency, such employees may work longer hours under permit from the Inspector, but these hours shall not exceed 12 hours per day or 72 hours per week.

Municipalities are empowered to pass by-laws under certain conditions respecting early closing hours in shops.

Hotels, Restaurants, Etc.: Regulations issued by the Lieutenant-Governor under authority of chapter 52, Statutes of 1918, provide that cooks and all other kitchen help shall have at least one day of rest each week, and that all other female employees except waitresses shall be entitled to two afternoons of rest each week. Male and female employees in hotel offices shall not be required to work more than 12 consecutive hours out of 24.

SASKATCHEWAN.

Factories and Shops: No young person or woman shall be employed in any factory for more than 9 hours per day or 50 hours per week except under special permit from the Inspector in cases of emergency. In such cases the hours for young persons and women shall not exceed 12½ hours per day and 72½ hours per week. The Minimum Wage Board created by *the Minimum Wage Act* which went into force on May 1, 1919, is empowered to establish standards of hours of employment as well as minimum wages for female workers in shops and factories in any city in the province.

Municipalities are empowered to pass by-laws under certain conditions respecting early closing hours in shops.

YUKON TERRITORY.

Public Works: No foreman or labourer employed on any public works shall be required or permitted to work more than 8 hours per day.

THE EIGHT-HOUR DAY MOVEMENT ABROAD

United States.

In the United States, federal legislation providing for an eight-hour day in certain Government contract work existed prior to 1892, but it was vaguely worded and uncertain in effect. An Act of 1890 provided for a straight eight hour day for labourers and mechanics employed by the Federal Government or by contractors or sub-contractors on public works. An exception might be made in cases of extraordinary emergency. The Federal Eight-Hour Act of 1912 made the 1892 Act more specific by enacting that no labourer or mechanic was to be required or permitted to work upon the subject matter of such contracts more than eight hours in any calendar day. In 1916, the Adamson law declared eight hours to be a day's work and the measure or standard of a day's work for reckoning the compensation for services of employees on railroads subject to the *Interstate Commerce Act*, if such employees are actually engaged in any capacity in the operation of trains in interstate or foreign commerce. In 1918, the McAdoo Award brought the eight-hour day into effect on all railroads in the United States.

Twenty-nine states of the union have enacted legislation reducing to eight hours the working day for employees in public employment or in private employment on contract work for national, state or municipal governments. At the end of 1918, fourteen states had enforced the eight-hour day for miners and eight states had forbidden the employment of men in smelting operations for longer than eight hours per day. Eleven states provide for an eight-hour day for men employed in industries involving special hazards.

By agreements between employers and workmen or by the award of an official labour adjustment body, an eight-hour day has been put in force in several industries. The members of the International Typographical Union won a concession on this point in 1906. An eight-hour day and forty-four hour week is the rule for the greater part of the building trades. The American Woollen Company, the largest of its kind in the United States, the United States Steel Corporation, the Ford Automobile Company and other large industrial establishments have adopted the basic eight-hour day. In 1916, the eight-hour day was made effective by agreement in the anthracite coal fields. Bituminous coal mining has been very largely an eight-hour industry, at least in the organized fields. From May, 1918, the slaughtering and meat-packing industry was changed from a ten-hour to an eight-hour basis. Large numbers of garment workers have also secured an eight-hour day. Lumber operators in the west have placed their establishments on an eight-hour day basis, while the newsprint industry was awarded these hours by the National War Labour Board, and also 45,000 longshoremen in Atlantic ports. The United States Department of Labour estimates the number of employees who had their work-day reduced to eight hours during the years 1915, 1916, 1917, and the first six months of 1918, at 1,448,532. The programme of the National War Labour Board committed the Board to the eight-hour day and through its awards it exerted a great influence on this movement whether it be for the straight eight-hour day or the eight-hour day as a basis for the calculation of wages, longer hours being regarded as overtime.

Great Britain.

Towards the end of 1918, arrangements were made for the adoption, early in 1919, of a forty-seven hour week in the engineering and shipbuilding trades,

f a forty-nine hour week for colliery surface workers, and of an eight-hour day or railway servants. In March, the forty-eight hour week was adopted in the printing and woollen trades. A little later dock labourers at the principal ports nd plumbers employed by master plumbers in various towns were granted a niform week of forty-four hours throughout the year; omnibus drivers and onductors and female laundry workers in London and workers in the clay industries were also awarded a forty-eight hour week, while in the flour milling rade the weekly hours of day workers were reduced to forty-seven and of shift orkers to forty-four. A uniform week of forty-eight hours was adopted for ay workers in the textile bleaching, dyeing, printing, etc., industries in Lanashire, Cheshire and Scotland for hosiery workers in the Midlands and for orkpeople in the furniture-removal and warehousing trades. In the first five onths of 1919, hours were reduced for 3,515,000 workers, the average reduction er week being between seven and eight hours per person.

The Coal Mines' Regulation Act, 1908, limited the hours of work underround to eight per day. The Coal Industry Commission in its interim report ubmitted in March, 1919, recommended the amendment of this Act by changing he eight hour limit to seven and "subject to the economic position of the industry at the end of 1920" a further change to six hours for underground orkers. A working week of forty-six hours for surface workers was also recommended in this report.

USTRALIA.

In Australia hours of labour are limited by law in the case of factories and hops, the general working week being forty-eight hours, and this period has been tandardized in most occupations. A strong demand has now arisen for a week f forty-four hours.

EW ZEALAND.

In New Zealand *the Factories Act, 1908*, made the forty-eight hour week gal in all places of occupation where two or more persons are employed in the reparation of goods for trade or sale.

RANCE.

In April of the present year, an Act was passed by the French Parliament roviding that the working hours of all workers shall not exceed eight a day r forty-eight a week or an equivalent limit over some period other than a week. he application of this principle to particular industries and localities is entrusted to the Government.

TALY.

A working day of eight hours has been introduced recently in the metal, gineering and shipbuilding industries and in the principal textile trades in aly. A unanimous decision by the agriculturists and representatives of agriltural workers was reached in April, 1919, whereby the hours of work for ricultural labourers hired by the day were to be reduced to eight. Overtime as to be allowed under certain conditions at special rates. Agreements between nployers and employed have been made regarding the eight-hour day or forty-ght hour week in the sugar refining and spirit industries, in the tailoring, llinery and allied trades in Milan, in the printing trades, and among the s workers. According to press despatches, the Italian Minister of Transport s issued a decree granting an eight-hour day to railwaymen, together with a ekly holiday.

SPAIN.

A Spanish Royal Decree of April 3, 1919, establishes a maximum legal working day of eight hours (or forty-eight hours a week) for all labour from October 1, 1919.

PORTUGAL.

In Portugal a Decree, effective June 1, 1919, limits the working hours to eight per day or forty-eight per week for all workpeople and employees of the state and administrative bodies, and of commercial and industrial corporations. For clerks in banks, exchanges and offices, the normal working day is fixed at seven hours.

SWITZERLAND.

By agreements the eight-hour day has been established in various industries in Switzerland—chocolate manufacture, boot and shoe industry (in the largest factory), milling, bookbinding and ribbon manufacture. The brewery workers, brush-makers, metal and machine-making trades and some textile industries are to adopt the eight-hour day in the near future.

DENMARK.

The Danish Employers' Association and the Federation of Trade Unions have concluded an agreement providing for an eight-hour working day from 1st January, 1920. A ministerial committee is considering the question of the legal adoption of the eight-hour day.

SWEDEN.

A bill for an eight-hour working day was introduced by the Government of Sweden but was rejected by the Upper Chamber.

HOLLAND.

In Holland the eight-hour day is in operation for all underground workers in coal mines and for surface workers at mines owned by the Government. During the past year the eight-hour day has been established in several factories and in municipal offices in Amsterdam and several other cities. A bill providing for an eight-hour day has been brought forward in Holland, according to a despatch to the Christian Science Monitor of the 30th June, 1919.

BELGIUM.

Employers in the metallurgic industry in Belgium have asked the Government to appoint a commission to study the question of an eight-hour day in Belgium and to prepare such ways and means of introducing the reform as are advisable.

GERMANY.

On November 23, 1918, the German National Office for Economic Demobilization issued an order limiting hours of labour in industrial establishments, including mining, to eight per day. This order is also applicable to Government and commercial establishments and to establishments engaged in the manufacture of agricultural products. In the case of railway and other transport workers and postal and telegraph workers, regulations are to be issued according to agreements between the managers' and workmen's associations, the principle of the eight-hour day being maintained.

THE MINIMUM WAGE IN CANADA

"In several of the Provinces of Canada the absence of a minimum wage law, particularly for women and girls, was mentioned as a serious cause of dissatisfaction. In four Provinces—Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Quebec—there is such a law administered by a Minimum Wage Board, by which the minimum rate to be paid is fixed from time to time. We believe that such a law should be enacted in all the Provinces, and should cover not only women and girls but unskilled labourers as well."

From the Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, 1919.

Legislation authorizing the establishing of minimum wages for women has been enacted in Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Quebec. In Manitoba and Saskatchewan the Boards charged with the administration of the Acts are composed of five persons and provision is made for compensation for their services. In British Columbia and Quebec the administrative bodies are of three members only and the Acts expressly state that no compensation is to be paid for the members' services. Other similarities between the Manitoba and Saskatchewan Acts are noted in the provisions made for investigations into hours of labour and working conditions as well as wages and the power to determine maximum hours as well as minimum wages. The original British Columbia Act provided for such investigations only in the case of girls under eighteen years of age, but an amendment made at the last session of the legislature extended the scope of the Act to hours of labour and working conditions generally. In Quebec wages only are made the subject of inquiry and determination. In Manitoba and Saskatchewan the Acts are, in the first instance, applicable only to the cities, but they may, at the discretion of the Boards, be extended to any portion of the provinces. In British Columbia the Act applies to all female employees within the province with the exception of farm labourers, fruit-pickers and domestic servants. In Quebec only women employed in industrial establishments are affected by the Act. A provision common to both the British Columbia and Quebec Acts is that authorizing the calling of a conference in any particular industry of representatives of employers, employees and the public, at which recommendations may be made regarding the wage to be established as a minimum in that industry. In Manitoba regulations of the Minimum Wage Board become effective one month after publication, and in Saskatchewan after thirty days. In British Columbia and Quebec sixty days must expire before regulations become operative.

Manitoba.

The Manitoba Act (Manitoba Statutes, 1918, cap. 38) provides for the appointment of a Board consisting of two representatives of employers, one of whom shall be a woman, two representatives of employees, one of whom shall be a woman; and one disinterested person. The Board is authorized to hold investigations and to issue orders fixing standards of minimum wages, maximum hours, and labour conditions for female employees in mail order houses, shops or factories in any city of Manitoba. The provisions of the Act may, at the discretion of the Board, be extended to any portion of Manitoba not in any city. The Board is also authorized to issue special licenses to physical defectives and apprentices. Under authority of this statute regulations have been published affecting twenty-five groups of occupations, including laundries, food-stuff factories, bag factories, leather goods factories, retail stores, etc., etc. Each set of regulations fixes a minimum weekly wage and maximum hours per day and week.

SPAIN.

A Spanish Royal Decree of April 3, 1919, establishes a maximum legal working day of eight hours (or forty-eight hours a week) for all labour from October 1, 1919.

PORTUGAL.

In Portugal a Decree, effective June 1, 1919, limits the working hours to eight per day or forty-eight per week for all workpeople and employees of the state and administrative bodies, and of commercial and industrial corporations. For clerks in banks, exchanges and offices, the normal working day is fixed at seven hours.

SWITZERLAND.

By agreements the eight-hour day has been established in various industries in Switzerland—chocolate manufacture, boot and shoe industry (in the largest factory), milling, bookbinding and ribbon manufacture. The brewery workers, brush-makers, metal and machine-making trades and some textile industries are to adopt the eight-hour day in the near future.

DENMARK.

The Danish Employers' Association and the Federation of Trade Unions have concluded an agreement providing for an eight-hour working day from 1st January, 1920. A ministerial committee is considering the question of the legal adoption of the eight-hour day.

SWEDEN.

A bill for an eight-hour working day was introduced by the Government of Sweden but was rejected by the Upper Chamber.

HOLLAND.

In Holland the eight-hour day is in operation for all underground workers in coal mines and for surface workers at mines owned by the Government. During the past year the eight-hour day has been established in several factories and in municipal offices in Amsterdam and several other cities. A bill providing for an eight-hour day has been brought forward in Holland, according to a despatch to the Christian Science Monitor of the 30th June, 1919.

BELGIUM.

Employers in the metallurgic industry in Belgium have asked the Government to appoint a commission to study the question of an eight-hour day in Belgium and to prepare such ways and means of introducing the reform as are advisable.

GERMANY.

On November 23, 1918, the German National Office for Economic Demobilization issued an order limiting hours of labour in industrial establishments, including mining, to eight per day. This order is also applicable to Government and commercial establishments and to establishments engaged in the manufacture of agricultural products. In the case of railway and other transport workers and postal and telegraph workers, regulations are to be issued according to agreements between the managers' and workmen's associations, the principle of the eight-hour day being maintained.

"In several of the Provinces of Canada the absence of a minimum wage law, particularly for women and girls, was mentioned as a serious cause of unsatisfaction. In four Provinces—Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Quebec—there is such a law administered by a Minimum Wage Board, by which the minimum rate to be paid is fixed from time to time. We believe that such a law should be enacted in all the Provinces, and should cover not only women and girls but unskilled labourers as well."

From the Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, 1919.

Legislation authorizing the establishing of minimum wages for women has been enacted in Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Quebec. In Manitoba and Saskatchewan the Boards charged with the administration of the Acts are composed of five persons and provision is made for compensation for their services. In British Columbia and Quebec the administrative bodies are of three members only and the Acts expressly state that no compensation is to be paid for the members' services. Other similarities between the Manitoba and Saskatchewan Acts are noted in the provisions made for investigations into hours of labour and working conditions as well as wages and the power to determine maximum hours as well as minimum wages. The original British Columbia Act provided for such investigations only in the case of girls under eighteen years of age, but an amendment made at the last session of the legislature extended the scope of the Act to hours of labour and working conditions generally. In Quebec wages only are made the subject of inquiry and determination. In Manitoba and Saskatchewan the Acts are, in the first instance, applicable only to the cities, but they may, at the discretion of the Boards, be extended to any portion of the provinces. In British Columbia the Act applies to all female employees within the province with the exception of farm labourers, fruit-pickers and domestic servants. In Quebec only women employed in industrial establishments are affected by the Act. A provision common to both the British Columbia and Quebec Acts is that authorizing the calling of a conference in any particular industry of representatives of employers, employees and the public, at which recommendations may be made regarding the wage to be established as a minimum in that industry. In Manitoba regulations of the Minimum Wage Board become effective one month after publication, and in Saskatchewan after thirty days. In British Columbia and Quebec sixty days must expire before regulations become operative.

Manitoba.

The Manitoba Act (Manitoba Statutes, 1918, cap. 38) provides for the appointment of a Board consisting of two representatives of employers, one of whom shall be a woman, two representatives of employees, one of whom shall be a woman; and one disinterested person. The Board is authorized to hold investigations and to issue orders fixing standards of minimum wages, maximum hours, and labour conditions for female employees in mail order houses, shops or factories in any city of Manitoba. The provisions of the Act may, at the discretion of the Board, be extended to any portion of Manitoba not in any city. The Board is also authorized to issue special licenses to physical defectives and apprentices. Under authority of this statute regulations have been published affecting twenty-five groups of occupations, including laundries, food-stuff factories, bag factories, leather goods factories, retail stores, etc., etc. Each set of regulations fixes a minimum weekly wage and maximum hours per day and week.

and also prescribes the conditions under which female workers may be employed. Apart from slight variations due to the nature of a particular industry, all the orders contain standard requirements concerning the health, safety and comfort of employees. The provisions respecting overtime, Sunday labour, payment of wages, etc., are also standardized to a great degree. Night labour and Sunday labour are forbidden and overtime shall be governed by the regulations of the Factories Act. Employers are required to allow one hour for lunch and to pay wages weekly. Where employees are hired by the week, one week's notice is required from the employer before discharging an employee, and from the employee before leaving employment. The minimum weekly wage fixed by the Board for experienced adults varies from $12 in retail stores, bag factories, glove factories, bedding factories, etc., to $9.50 in pickle factories, macaroni factories and laundries. In each instance lower minimum wage rates are fixed for adult learners and for minors, but the number of employees of each of these classes is limited to twenty-five per cent of the total number of female workers. A nine-hour day is established by the regulations for all the industries affected except retail stores for which the maximum is set at eight and one-half hours. The maximum hours per week vary from forty-eight to fifty-two, according to the industry.

British Columbia.

Under the British Columbia *Minimum Wage Act*, (British Columbia Statutes, 1918, cap. 56) a Board is constituted as part of the Department of Labour, consisting of the Deputy Minister of Labour as Chairman, and two other members, one of whom must be a woman. No compensation is to be paid persons acting on the Minimum Wage Board. The Board is empowered to hold meetings, make inquiries, and consider and recommend minimum wages for women employed in any trade, business or occupation, with the exception of farm labourers, fruit-pickers and domestic servants. Authority is also given for the calling of a conference representing equally employers and employed, together with a small number of disinterested persons representing the public. Recommendations made by this conference may be approved or rejected by the Minimum Wage Board. In the case of rejection a further conference may be held. The Board is also given certain powers respecting the regulation of working conditions for girls under eighteen years of age, and the issuing of licenses for the employment of physical defectives or apprentices at a minimum wage less than that fixed for experienced adults. An amendment to *the Minimum Wage Act, 1918*, passed at the recent session of the legislature of British Columbia, extends the powers of the Board to include the fixing of hours of labour and conditions of employment for women workers as well as minimum wages for these employees.

A Coal Miners' Minimum Wage Board for British Columbia was created by an amendment made in 1919 to *the Coal Mines Regulation Act*. This Board is to be composed of the chief mine inspector and two other members appointed by the mine owners and the miners respectively. Any portion of the province may be defined by the Board as a minimum wage district, and a minimum wage established accordingly for the employment of coal miners in that district.

Saskatchewan.

The Province of Saskatchewan enacted a *Minimum Wage Act* in February of the present year to become operative on the 1st of May, 1919. The Board charged with the administration of the Act is to consist of five persons, two of

whom are to be women. Authority is granted to ascertain what wages are adequate, what hours of labour reasonable, and what sanitary conditions proper, and to establish such standards of minimum wages and hours of employment as are deemed advisable for the employment of women.

Similar provision to that of the other provinces is made for the employment of defectives or apprentices under license at a lower wage than that established for formal employees. The Act is applicable to the cities of Saskatchewan, but may be extended at the discretion of the Board to any portion of the province.

QUEBEC.

The Women's Minimum Wage Act of Quebec came into force immediately after its passage in March, 1919. Under this act the Commission appointed to carry out its provisions consists of three persons, one member being a woman. This Act states that no remuneration is to be paid members of the Commission for their services.

The determination of the minimum wage to be fixed in any industrial establishment may be arrived at by the vote of a conference of persons representing equally the employers and employed in the industry, together with a number of disinterested persons and a member of the Commission as chairman. The decision of the conference must be approved by the Commission.

Provision is also made by this Act for the employment of women who are physically handicapped, or who are apprentices, at a lower rate of wages than that fixed for experienced adults. A special scale of wages may be fixed for girls under eighteen years of age.

ALBERTA.

The Factories Act, 1917, (Alberta Statutes, 1917, cap. 20) fixed a minimum wage of $1.50 per day for all persons employed in factories, shops, offices or office buildings, except apprentices, who may be paid a minimum wage of $1.00 per day.

An amendment to the *Factories Act*, made at the 1919 session of the legislature, (Alberta Statutes, 1919, cap. 4, sec. 29) enables the appointment by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council in any town having a population of five thousand, of an advisory committee of two persons representing employers and employed, to which must be added a third member appointed by the Attorney-General. The Chief inspector may, on the recommendation of such a committee, make such regulations as may be deemed proper regarding the hours of labour of any persons employed in factories, shops, offices or office buildings, or respecting the minimum wage at which any female person may be employed. No regulation made under this amendment is to permit a lower wage or a greater number of hours per week than is allowed by the *Factories Act*.

THE MINIMUM WAGE IN OTHER COUNTRIES

The establishment of a minimum wage for the employment of women and minors and for adult males in unorganized or poorly organized and ill-paid industries has made considerable progress in various countries. The recognition of the fact that a certain standard of life is essential in the best interests of the

nation has led to the adoption of the principle of the minimum wage in New Zealand, Australia, Great Britain, France, Switzerland, and the United States. Impetus has been given to this movement recently by the increased cost of maintaining a standard of life that the general feeling of a country demands for its citizens.

NEW ZEALAND.

New Zealand was the first to adopt this principle in *the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1894*. This Act was primarily for the settlement of industrial disputes and conferred on the Arbitration Court established by the Act power to fix conditions of employment, including the fixing of minimum rates of wages to be paid in the cases brought before it. Councils of Conciliation were provided for in an amending Act of 1899 and an agreement on a minimum rate might be reached at such a Council without reference to the Arbitration Court. New Zealand has also a general law first enacted in 1899 and later embodied in *the Factories Act* of 1908 by which a minimum wage is established below which no person may be employed.

AUSTRALIA.

In Australia the various states have laws providing for the fixing of minimum wages. Western Australia followed the method employed in New Zealand. Legislation passed in 1900, and amended in 1902 and 1912, provided for a Court of Arbitration which is to base its awards on the cost of living; "no minimum rate of wages or other remuneration shall be prescribed which is not sufficient to enable the average worker to whom it applies to live in reasonable comfort, having regard to any domestic obligations to which such average worker would be ordinarily subject."

Victoria was the first state of the Commonwealth to make provision for the establishment of minimum wages. Its system of Wages-Boards has been largely followed in the other states. An act of 1896 was a temporary measure, but in succeeding years the principle was maintained, and in *the Factories and Shops Act, 1912*, previous legislation was consolidated. The formation of Wages-Boards was authorized for sweated trades, but there are now Boards in practically all the industries of Victoria.

In New South Wales, the legislation for the settlement of industrial disputes became in 1908 the means whereby minimum rates of wages could be established in any industries brought before the Industrial Court which was authorized to constitute a Board for each of such industries. In order to apply the same principle to persons employed in clerical work, *the Clerical Workers' Act, 1910*, was passed as an amendment to the Act of 1908. *The Industrial Arbitration Act of 1912* and succeeding legislation have continued the principle of the minimum wage to be determined after investigation into the particular trade or industry. In 1918, an amending Act instituted a Board of Trade with extensive powers, its most important function outside of provision for conciliation in industrial disputes, being to collect information which will enable the Arbitration Court to determine a living wage, on which basis the Court will declare once a year what is to be the living wage for males and females for the year, either in the state as a whole or in any defined area. This general declaration will entitle every employee in any form of industry, whether regulated by arbitration or not, to such a wage. In addition, a distinct minimum wage may be fixed for each industry, consideration being given to questions of skill and continuity of employment. The Court is also authorized to fix the quantity of

work or services that may be required for such a wage. This last piece of legislation supersedes *the Minimum Wage Act of 1910*, which provided that no person employed in preparing or manufacturing any article for trade or sale, or in any factory, or working at any handicraft, or any shop assistant, should be paid less than a wage fixed by the Act.

In 1908, Queensland enacted legislation modeled generally on the Victoria acts and aimed primarily at sweating.

The South Australian Act of 1900 established a minimum below which no one could be employed and provided for the formation of Wages Boards in certain industries. Delay in drafting satisfactory regulations prevented the establishment of any Boards until 1905, and up till 1908 the system was not in working order. In 1912, the Wages-Boards were continued under *the Industrial Arbitration Act*, but an Industrial Court similar to that of New South Wales was added and given power to prescribe wages "sufficient for the normal and reasonable needs of the average employee living in the locality where the work is done."

In 1910, Tasmania adopted the Victorian system of Wages-Boards for certain trades and decreed that the minimum wage to be fixed should be based on and must not exceed "the average prices or rates of payment by reputable employers to employees of average capacity." Objections to this basis were so great that the provision was repealed in 1911 and the determination left to the Board after investigating into the industry.

The Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1904, instituted a Court of Conciliation and Arbitration which may fix minimum wages in the case of employees affected by any industrial dispute extending beyond the limits of any one state or in the Federal capital.

GREAT BRITAIN.

In Great Britain, minimum wages are determined for certain industries by Trade Boards established for the purpose by *the Trade Boards Act, 1909*. The four trades originally brought under the Act were selected as being specially subject to sweating, but other trades have been brought within the scope of the Act since that date. The Trade Boards, consisting of equal numbers of representatives of employers and workmen, together with a smaller number of appointed members, are authorized to fix minimum rates of wages for particular trades.

The original trades, more than two-thirds of which were composed of women workers, were ready-made tailoring and wholesale tailoring, employing upwards of 200,000 persons, about one-third of whom were men; paper-box making, employing about 25,000 persons; lace and net finishing, employing about 10,000; and certain kinds of chain making, employing some 3,000 persons, of whom about 1,000 were men. In 1913, to the trades already under the operation of the Act were added the sugar, confectionery and food preserving trade of about 80,000 persons; shirt-making, employing some 40,000; hollow ware trade, employing 15,000, and linen and cotton embroidery, employing about 1,000 persons. In 1918, an amendment to *the Trade Boards Act* was passed enabling the application of the Act to a larger number of trades and rendering the process of this extension more rapid, "as there is reason to fear that the problem of inadequate wages for unskilled and unorganized workers—particularly women—may be rendered exceptionally acute."

The legal minimum wage principle has been applied in Great Britain to coal-mining, an industry composed very largely of adult males, and strongly

organized. *The Coal Mines (Minimum Wage) Act*, 1912, provided for the establishment of Boards for fixing minimum rates for all underground workers in coal mines, who numbered over 800,000 persons. The Act was to expire three years after its approval unless extended by Parliament.

A further application of this principle was made by *the Corn Production Act, 1917*, which provided for the establishment by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, after consultation with the Ministry of Labour, of an Agricultural Wages Board for "workmen" employed in agriculture. The term "workmen" includes boys, women and girls as well as men, and employment in agriculture includes work not only on farms, but also on osier land, woodland, orchards, market gardens and nursery grounds.

The Wages (Temporary Regulation) Act, passed in November, 1918, applies to all trades and industries except such as may be excluded by the Minister of Labour, and compels the continuation of such rates of wages as were in force on the 11th November for a six months' period. The operation of this Act has been extended for another six months.

FRANCE.

In France, the principle of the minimum wage was first introduced into legislation in 1915. By this Act female home-workers in the clothing industry are to receive a minimum wage determined on the basis of the usual local wage paid for the same work to female workers in shops. The minimum wage is to be revised at least every three years.

SWITZERLAND.

In Switzerland, minimum time and piece rates have been fixed by an order of the Federal Council, 1917, for the embroidery industry.

UNITED STATES.

In the United States, several states have passed minimum wage laws establishing Boards to inquire into the conditions under which women and minors are appointed and to fix minimum rates of wages for their employment. Washington, Wisconsin, Arkansas, Colorado, California, Oregon, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Minnesota and Kansas have made provision for the establishment of minimum wages either through special Boards or Commissions or through the branch of the state government responsible for the administration of labour laws.

In Utah a specific minimum wage is fixed by the legislature.

The Federal Government of the United States has established a Minimum Wage Board for the District of Columbia to fix minimum wages for the employment of women, and the present session of Congress is considering the adoption of a minimum wage of $3.00 per day for all employees of the Federal Government.

CANADA

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

of Dominion and Provincial Governments
with Representative Employers and Labour Men,
at Ottawa, September, 1919.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINCS AND DISCUSSIONS

FIRST DAY.

CONTENTS.

Opening of Conference:
The Minister of Labour presides.
Representatives of Dominion and Provincial Governments in Attendance.
List of Delegates.
Singing of the National Anthem.

Message from Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister.

Addresses by Hon. A. L. Sifton, Hon. N. W. Rowell, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Col. D. Carnegie (on Whitley Councils in England), Mr. W. Jett Lauck (former secretary of United States War Labour Board), Mr. E. G. Henderson, Mr. Tom Moore, Mr. Warren S. Stone.

Report of Committee on Agenda.

The Senate Chamber,

Ottawa, Monday, September, 15, 1919.

MORNING SESSION.

The National Industrial Conference of Dominion and Provincial Ministers and of Representative Employers and Labour Men, summoned by the Government of Canada for the consideration of industrial relations and labour laws, was opened this day at 10.30 a.m., in the Chamber of the Senate of Canada.

Hon. Senator Gideon D. Robertson, Minister of Labour for Canada, presided.

Mr. Gerald H. Brown acted as Secretary of the Conference.

There were present as representatives of the Government of Canada, in addition to the Minister of Labour, Hon. Charles J. Doherty, Minister of Justice, Hon. N. W. Rowell, President of the Privy Council, and Hon. Arthur L. Sifton, Minister of Public Works.

There were also present the following representatives of Provincial Governments:

Ontario: Sir William Hearst, Premier; Hon. F. G. Macdiarmid, Minister of Public Works; Dr. W. A. Riddell, Deputy Minister of Labour.

Quebec: Mr. Louis Guyon, Deputy Minister of Labour.

Manitoba: Hon. T. C. Norris, Premier; Hon. T. H. Johnson, Attorney General; Mr. Ed. McGrath, Secretary, Bureau of Labour.

British Columbia: Hon. J. W. de B. Farris, Minister of Labour; J. D. McNiven, Deputy Minister of Labour.

Saskatchewan: Hon. C. A. Dunning, Minister of Agriculture and Minister in charge of labour matters; T. M. Molloy, Provincial Inspector of Factories.

There were also present, by invitation, the executive heads of four International Railway Brotherhood, namely: Warren S. Stone, Grand Chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; W. G. Lee, Grand President of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; L. E. Sheppard, President of the Order

of Railway Conductors; J. E. Manion, President of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers.

The following delegates were present:

EMPLOYERS' DELEGATES.

Representing Manufacturing Interests in General—
T. P. Howard, Phoenix Bridge & Iron Works, Ltd., Montreal.
S. R. Parsons, British American Oil Co., Ltd., Toronto.
M. P. White, Canadian General Electric Co., Ltd., Toronto.
J. E. Davies, Alberta Foundry & Machine Co., Ltd., Medicine Hat.
J. G. Gemant, International Harvester Co. of Canada, Ltd., Hamilton.
J. L. Costello, of Wood Manufacturing Co., Ltd., Winnipeg.
E. Parnell, Spiers, Parnell Baking Co., Winnipeg.
T. R. Deacon, Manitoba Bridge & Iron Works, Ltd., Winnipeg.
J. B. Thomson, James Thomson & Sons, Ltd., Vancouver.
A. R. Weeks, Canadian Northwest Steel Co., Ltd., Vancouver.
J. J. Coughlan, J. Coughlan & Sons, Vancouver.
W. S. Fisher, Sackville, N.B.

Shipping—
Thos. Robb, secretary, Shipping Federation of Canada, Montreal, (on behalf of Eastern shipping interests).
G. M. Bosworth, chairman, C. P. Ocean Service, Montreal, (on behalf of Pacific Coast shipping interests).

Shipbuilding—
P. L. Miller, Canadian Vickers, Montreal.
Alex. Welch, Halifax Shipyards, Halifax.

Pulp and Paper—
F. A. Sabbaton, Laurentide Co., Ltd., Grand' Mère.
Col. C. H. L. Jones, Spanish River Pulp & Paper Co., Sault Ste. Marie.

Milling—
W. A. Lawson, of Bemis Bag Co., Ltd., Winnipeg.

Packing—
J. S. McLean, Harris Abattoir Co., Ltd., Toronto.
O. W. Waller, Swift Canadian Co., Ltd., Toronto.

Steel and Iron—
F. H. Whitton, The Steel Co. of Canada, Ltd., Hamilton.
Ross McMaster, Montreal.

Food Products (other than milling and packing)—
Jas. Ruddy, Canada Starch Co., Ltd., Brantford.

Woollens—
Richard Thomson, Hawthorn Mills, Carleton Place.

Garment Manufactures—
J. S. McKinnon, S. F. McKinnon & Co., Ltd., Toronto.

Cottons—
F. G. Daniels, Dominion Textile Co., Ltd., Montreal.

Lumber and Timber—
Angus McLean, Bathurst Lumber Co., Ltd., Bathurst, N.B.
J. Fraser Gregory, Murray & Gregory, Ltd., St. John, N.B.
J. Fred. Booth, J. R. Booth, Ottawa.
Bruce N. Farris, King Lumber Co., Newton, B.C.

Manufactures of Lumber and Timber—
John R. Shaw, Canada Furniture Manufacturers, Ltd., Woodstock.

Printing, Publishing and Bookbinding—
W. J. Bulman, Bulman Brothers, Ltd., Winnipeg.

Rubber—
C. H. Carlisle, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. of Canada, Ltd., Toronto.

Chemicals and Allied Products—
E. G. Henderson, Canada Salt Co., Ltd., Windsor.

Clay, Glass and Stone Products—
F. P. Jones, Canada Cement Co., Ltd., Montreal.

Tobacco and its Manufactures—
W. T. Gregory, Imperial Tobacco Co., Leamington, Ont.

Vehicles for Land Transportation—
G. M. McGregor, Ford Motor Co. of Canada, Ltd., Ford, Ont.

Oils, Paints and Varnishes—
Dr. D. Strachan, Imperial Oil Co., Ltd., Sarnia.

Leather and its Products—
Hon. E. J. Davis, Davis Leather Co., Ltd., Newmarket, Ont.

Machinery—
Henry Bertram, John Bertram & Sons Co., Ltd., Dundas, Ont.

Telephones—
J. E. Macpherson, Bell Telephone Co. of Canada, Ottawa.

Building and Construction—
Col. J. A. Little, Thunder Bay Harbour Improvement Co., Port Arthur.
J. Clark Reilly, Montreal.
E. R. Reid, Engineers and Contractors, Ltd., St. John, N.B.
Fred. Armstrong, F. Armstrong Co., Toronto.
J. P. Anglin, 65 Victoria St., Montreal.
G. A. Whitlock, Moose Jaw.

Wholesale Trade—
James H. Ashdown, J. H. Ashdown Hardware Co., Winnipeg.
Hugh Blain, Eby-Blain Co., Ltd., Toronto.
George B. Fraser, Greenshields, Ltd., Montreal.

Retail Trade—
J. A. Banfield, president, Dominion Executive Council, Retail Merchants' Association, Winnipeg.
J. G. Watson, first vice-president, Dominion Executive Council, Retail Merchants' Association, Montreal.
E. M. Trowern, secretary, Dominion Executive Council, Retail Merchants' Association, Ottawa.

Fishing—
A. H. Brittain, Maritime Fishing Corporation, Ltd., Montreal.
Capt. F. Wallace, Montreal.

Street Railways—
G. Gordon Gale, vice-president and general manager, Hull Electric Company, Hull.

Electric Power—
A. Monro Grier, K.C., president, Canadian Electrical Association, Toronto.
P. W. Ellis, Hydro-Electric Commission, Toronto.

Theatrical Interests—
W. T. Breen, Royal Alexandra Theatre, Toronto.

Railway Transportation and Telegraphs—
F. L. Wanklyn, general executive asst., C.P.R.
A. J. Hills, assistant to the president, Canadian National Railways.
G. C. Jones, assistant to the president, Grand Trunk Railway.
F. P. Brady, general manager, Eastern Lines, Canadian National Railways.
S. J. Hungerford, assistant to the vice-president, Canadian National Railways.
George Hodge, assistant to the vice-president, Eastern Lines, C.P.R.

Mining—
D. H. McDougall, president, Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co., Ltd., New Glasgow, N.S.
Geo. R. Smith, Bell Abestos Mines, Thetford, Que.
W. R. Wilson, Crow's Nest Pass Coal Co., Fernie, B.C.

Canadian Bankers' Association—
H. B. Mackenzie, asst. general manager, Bank of Montreal, Montreal.
Henry T. Ross, secretary, Canadian Bankers' Association, Montreal.

British Columbia Employers' Association—
E. C. Knight, president, Vancouver.

EMPLOYEES' DELEGATES

Trades and Labour Congress—
Tom Moore, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Ottawa, Ont.
P. M. Draper, International Typographical Union, Ottawa, Ont.

Robert Baxter, United Mine Workers of America, Glace Bay, N.S.
Arthur Martel, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Montreal, Que.

Building Trades—
A. E. Stirling, International Brotherhood of Painters and Decorators, Regina.
Tom Izzard, Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers, Toronto.
F. H. Healey, Portable and Hoisting Engineers, Niagara Falls, Ont.
Jas. F. Marsh, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Niagara Falls, Ont.
Jos. P. Hunter, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers, Niagara Falls, Ont.
James Winning, Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers, Winnipeg, Man.

Clothing Trades—
Fred Bush, United Garment Workers of America, Toronto, Ont.
S. Koldofsky, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, Toronto.

Metal Trades—
J. H. Kennedy, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers, Toronto.
W. G. Hunter, Pattern Makers' Association, Toronto.
J. T. Foster, International Association of Machinists, Montreal.
W. C. Powlesland, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers, Toronto.

Railway Shop Trades—
R. J. Tallan, International Association of Machinists, Calgary, Alta.
Stanley Steeves, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Moncton, N.B.
James Somerville, International Association of Machinists, Moosejaw, Sask.

Freight Handlers—
A. C. Hay, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, Winnipeg, Man.
A. R. Mosher, Canadian Brotherhood of Railroad Employees, Ottawa, Ont.

Shipbuilding and Marine Trades—
Fred Welsh, United Association, Plumbers and Steamfitters, Vancouver, B.C.
R. C. McCutcheon, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders, Winnipeg, Man.
J. E. Morash, Brotherhood of Boilermakers and Iron Shipbuilders, Halifax.
Omer Fleury, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Quebec.
John A. McClelland, International Association of Machinists, Montreal.

Textile Workers—
W. A. Foucher, United Textile Workers, Montreal.

Lena Cormier, United Textile Workers, Moncton.

Leather and Tannery—
F. Grant, International Brotherhood Amalgamated Leather Workers, Kingston.
Jas. A. Sullivan, Cigarmakers', International Union, Hamilton.

Shipping—
J. C. Gauthier, Montreal.
J. E. Tighe, International Longshoremen's Association, St. John, N. B.
A. F. Brunet, Montreal.

Woodworking Manufacturing—
T. Jackson, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Toronto Ont.

Power House Employees—
Jas. W. Frame, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Calgary, Alta.

Printing Trades—
James Drury, International Typographical Union, Montreal, Que.
R. A. Rigg, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, Winnipeg, Man.
W. R. Trotter, International Typographical Union, Vancouver, B. C.
A. J. Larden, International Printing Pressmen and Assistants, Ottawa, Ont.

Mining—
David Irvine, Calgary.
B. Neilly, Penn, Can. Mines Ltd., Cobalt.
L. J. Rousseau, Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, Thetford Mines, Que.
Jos. Gorman, Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, Cobalt, Ont.

Boot and Shoe Workers—
E. W. A. O'Dell, Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, Hamilton, Ont.

Broom Makers—
W. R. Rollo, Broom and Whisk Makers' Union, Hamilton, Ont.

Hotel Trades—
Arthur O'Leary, Hotel and Restaurant Employees', International Alliance and Bartenders' International League, Toronto, Ont.
William McKenzie, Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance, Vancouver, B. C.

Packing Houses—
L. Braithwaite, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, Toronto, Ont.

Paper Trades—
Jas. Lockwood, International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
Maurice LaBelle, International Brotherhood Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, Ottawa, Ont.

Iron and Steel—
E. Dalrymple, Amalgamated Association Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.
J. A. Gillis, Amalgamated Association Iron, Steel and Tin Workers, Sydney, N. S.
J. Barnett, International Association of Moulders, Hamilton.

Civic Employees—
W. P. Harpur, Policemen's Federal Association, London, Ont.
Henry Bishop, Civic Employees' Union Edmonton, Alta.

Clerical and Retail Trades—
Joseph Sexton, Clerical Workers' Union, Glace Bay, N.S.
E. S. Woodward, Retail Clerks' International Protective Association, Carlin street, Victoria, B.C.

Pottery Trades—
Geo. Smith, National Brotherhood Operative Poters, St. John's, Que.

General Trades—
John A. Flett, Federal Unions, Hamilton, Ont.
C. R. Melvin, Federal Unions, St. John, N. B.

Publishing Trades—
James Simpson, International Typographical Union and Industrial Banner, Labour Temple, Toronto.
Gus. Francq, International Typographical Union and Labour World, Montreal, Que.

Amusement Trades—
Wm. P. Covert, International Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators, Toronto, Ont.
D. A. Carey, American Federation of Musicians, Toronto, Ont.

Women Workers—
Mrs. Kathleen Derry, Boot and Shoe Worker's Union, Toronto.
Doris Meakin, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (Telephone Operators), Labour Temple, Winnipeg, Man.
Helena Gutteridge, United Garment Workers, Vancouver. B. C.

Dominion Public Service Employees—
F. Grierson, president, Civil Service Federation of Canada, Ottawa, Ont.
J. C. O'Connor, 2nd vice-president, Civil Service Federation of Canadá, Ottawa, Ont.
Major M. A. MacInnes, president, Western Canada Interior Association, Saskatoon, Sask.

W. A. Macdonald, vice-president, Dominion Letter Carriers's Association, Hamilton, Ont.

Railway Transportation and Telegraphs—
Canadian Railway Board of Adjustment No. 1.:—
S. N. Berry, Senior Vice-president, Order of Railway Conductors, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, U.S.A.
J. M. Mein, Deputy President, Order Railroad Telegraphers, Montreal, Que.
Geo. K. Wark, Vice-president, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, Montreal, Que.
James Murdock, Vice-president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Montreal, Que.
Ash Kennedy, Assistant Grand Chief, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Montreal, Que.

W. L. Best, Legislative Representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Ottawa, Ont.

L. L. Pelletier, Dominion Legislative Representative, Order of Railroad Conductors, Ottawa, Ont.

J. O'Hara, Maintenance of Way Employees and Railway Shop Trades.

THIRD GROUP.

Charles R. Harrison, M.P., North Bay, Ont., late member of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations.

J. W. Bruce, General Organizer of United Association of Plumbers and Steamfitters, Toronto, Ont., late member of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations.

Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, Ottawa.

Hon. Senator Smeaton White, Montreal, Que., late member of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations.

Wills Maclachlan, Toronto, Ont., vice-chairman, Labour Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee of the Cabinet.

Calvin Lawrence, member of the Labour Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee of the Cabinet.

H. J. Daly, Toronto, Ont., member of the Labour Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee of the Cabinet.

G. Frank Beer, Toronto, Ont., member of the Labour Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee of the Cabinet.

Col. David Carnegie, London, England, member of the Labour Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee of the Cabinet.

Major W. D. Tait, Ottawa, Ont., member of the Labour Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee of the Cabinet.

J. A. Stevenson, Ottawa, Ont., member of the Labour Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee of the Cabinet.

R. B. Maxwell, vice-president, G.W.V.A. of Canada, Ottawa.

John Lowe, Valleyfield, Que., member of the Reconstruction and Development Committee of the Cabinet.

H. Mortimer-Lamb, secretary, Canadian Mining Institute, Montreal, Que.

R. R. Grant, Joint Com. Technical Organizations, Toronto, Ont.

Charles A. Magrath, chairman, International Joint Commission, Ottawa.

F. R. Ewart, American Institute of Electrical Engineers, Toronto, Ont.

Sir John Willison, president, Canadian Reconstruction Association, Toronto, Ont.

Alderman C. H. Grant, Edmonton, Alberta.

Arthur Roberts, K.C., Bridgewater, vice-president, Union of Canadian Municipalities.

Mayor T. D. Bouchard, St. Hyacinthe, Que.

W. E. Segsworth, Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, Ottawa.

W. Jett Lauck, late secretary U. S. War Labour Board, Washington, D.C.

Col. Thos. Cantley, Director Canadian National Railways, New Glasgow, N.S.

Major L. L. Anthes, Director of Information and Service, Dept. of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, Ottawa, Ont.

T. A. Stevenson, Assistant Director of Information and Service, Dept. of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, Ottawa, Ont.

Geo. H. Clark, Seed Branch, Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ont.

J. A. Ruddick, Dairy and Cold Storage Commissioner, Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ont.

Fraser S. Keith, Montreal, Engineering Inst. of Canada.

Prof. H. M. MacKay, Montreal, Engineering Inst. of Canada.

It was expected that Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, would open the

conference with an address, but owing to illness he was unable to be present.

The CHAIRMAN, in calling the conference to order, said: Ladies and gentlemen, behind all our hopes for Canada's future prosperity and progress, there lies a distinct feeling of relief and sincere gratitude because of the victory given and because of the outlook that we now have for the people; and, inasmuch as we are gathered together in this Chamber, where His Majesty's representative, the Governor General, opens and closes Parliament, I suggest that it is particularly fitting that we open this conference by the singing of our National Anthem.

In accordance with the Chairman's suggestion, the delegates then rose and sang the first stanza of the National Anthem.

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, I am sure that every one present joins in the feeling of regret at the enforced absence of the Prime Minister because of illness. We had hoped and confidently expected that Sir Robert would be present and deliver an address of welcome to this conference, and I know that he was extremely desirous of doing so, because of his interest in the questions to which you are to give consideration. Up till, I think, Saturday, Sir Robert had hoped to be able to be present. Finding it impossible to be here, because of his health not permitting it, he has sent to us from his home this morning, a message for the conference, and I would therefore like, without any preliminary remarks, to read to you Sir Robert's message. The Prime Minister, in greeting this conference, says:—

MESSAGE OF SIR ROBERT BORDEN.

To my great regret, I am prevented from addressing you in person; but it is my privilege, through this message, to bid you welcome and to express my earnest and confident hope that your labours will be crowned with such success as to justify most amply the summoning of this conference.

In common with every nation in the world, the Canadian people are called upon to meet new and untried conditions surrounded with difficulties not less grave and complex than those which we encountered at the outbreak of war and during its continuance. Canada, in the extent and variety of her resources and in the energy, persistence and initiative of her people, is more thoroughly equipped for meeting these difficulties than most nations. The first great essential is to keep constantly in our minds a thorough realization of actual conditions and of the needs by which they are attended. The second and not less vital essential is to bring to bear upon the problems of peace, the unity of purpose and of action, the persistence and determination, in short the national spirit, which maintained our effort throughout the war.

For half a century or more Canada has been a great borrowing country. Enormous sums, chiefly borrowed in the London market, have been brought into this country not only by the Federal, Provincial and municipal authorities, but by industrial and commercial institutions. The interest on these borrowings constitutes a heavy charge upon our future which can only be met by constantly increasing production of all commodities for which we can find a profitable sale in the markets of the world.

Five years ago the interest charge upon the Federal debt of Canada was less than $13,000,000. During the coming fiscal year the interest payable on our federal debt will be at least $115,000,000. In addition there will be for many years to come an annual charge of from thirty to forty million dollars to provide pensions for our gallant soldiers and for the dependents of those who have fallen. Owing to the largely increased cost of operation on this continent our extensive system of national railways will confront us with considerable deficits for an indefinite period; and, if our railways are to be maintained and developed in any reasonable proportion to the needs of the people, a heavy capital expenditure will be necessary within a very short time. One grave governmental problem is to find such means of raising the enormous sums annually required for meeting these charges and for carrying on the ordinary administration of public affairs as will not drive away capital, restrict industry or hinder development.

For many years before the war there had been an adverse balance of trade against Canada. During the war this condition was absolutely reversed; but the change was due in no small measure to the enormous production and exportation of munitions of war and to the higher prices obtained for our grain, foodstuffs and other exports. Unless there is largely increased production accomplished under such conditions as will enable us to compete in the world's markets, there is serious danger of an unfortunate return to pre-war conditions. There should be no such outcome, for we have at hand, and in abundance, the raw materials upon

which a great industrial development should be securely based.

Here, as elsewhere, there has been conflict between capital and labour, with the inevitable consequence that production has been checked and development hindered. In many cases the results of such conflict were inconclusive, and the struggle was merely postponed until one of the parties selected what it deemed a favourable opportunity for renewing it. The lockout and the strike have been in too frequent evidence and too often there has been reluctance or refusal to compose difficulties by more reasonable methods. The general subject has been examined with conspicuous zeal and ability by a Royal Commission established early in April last. An elaborate report of the majority of the commission, together with a minority report expressing the views of two of its members, will be submitted to this conference for discussion and consideration.

Questions touching the welfare of the labouring populations of the world were under attentive consideration during the Peace Conference; and the Peace Treaty set forth conclusions and recommendations which have already been made public and which will be commended to your attention during this conference. The Peace Conference also affirmed that war is no longer to be regarded as a recognized method of settling international differences. In establishing a League of Nations the Conference addressed itself to the task of substituting for the horrors of war the peaceful determination of arbitral tribunals. Thirty-two nations consecrated their future endeavour to the maintenance of the eternal principle that right and not might shall reign in the world's body politic. If among nations so widely divergent in material, social and political development, so sharply divided by ancient antagonisms and divergent interests, it was possible to secure unanimity in the ideals embodied in the Covenant, surely it behooves every member of the League to find within its own body politic means of composing industrial differences otherwise than by industrial war. The nation that is able to solve for itself most thoroughly and satisfactorily the questions involved in this issue need not fear for its place in the industrial development of the world.

It is perfectly idle to expect that grave and difficult questions will not arise between employer and employed in this country. These questions must be solved in such reasonable manner and by such effective methods as will command the confidence of both capital and labour. On the one hand employers must realize that out of the horror and welter of this war new ideals have been evolved and new conditions established. Industrial development and supremacy have sometimes been purchased at a price greater than any people can afford to pay. I am speaking not of conditions in this country, but of those which, to my knowledge, have prevailed elsewhere. The physical degeneracy of a considerable portion of the population is too high a price to pay for domination of the world's markets. If in any lines of industrial development we cannot hold our own without so terrible a sacrifice, then such lines ought to be abandoned and our effort directed elsewhere. Labour is something more than a commodity. The physical well-being and the moral welfare of the people should go hand in hand. Standards of living which are regarded as satisfactory in some industrial communities of the world cannot be tolerated in this country. The employer if he is wise, will concern himself with all the recommendations and suggestions laid down in the Peace Conference as to hours of labour, sanitary conditions, protection of women and children, and the general welfare of the labouring man. There can be no permanent or satisfactory industrial development which is not founded on the welfare of the labouring population which maintains it.

On the other hand, there are considerations which the labour organizations of the country will do well to bear in remembrance. Full right of organization on the part of both employees and employers has become so well recognized a principle that those who do not accept it are in a small and short-sighted minority. The rights of both employees and employers are thus moulded and governed by agreements reached through negotiations between such organizations in the different trades. But there can be no hope of the co-operation and confidence which are not only desirable but vital unless obligations thus entered into are maintained inviolate and unbroken on both sides. If they are to be regarded as mere scraps of paper to be cast aside when convenience or advantage dictates, then there can be no faith and no security.

One other consideration I should dwell upon. During the past five years the world has wasted more than it saved in half a century. That waste must be made up through increased production, and this can-

not be accomplished during shorter working hours unless there is increased efficiency resulting in increased output. The relation of the output to the fixed or overhead charges directly and materially affects the cost. Moreover, the industries of Canada are not yet organized or developed upon the vast scale reached in some countries with which we are called upon to compete in the world's markets. In such countries an enormous output materially reduces the cost of the finished article. If we cannot sell to advantage the industries concerned must develop a lower cost of production or they must discontinue. Thus, increased relative efficiency is as important to labour as to capital, and it is as essential in the office of the management as on the floor of the factory.

We are grateful for the presence of so important and representative an assembly. To the representatives of the Provincial Governments we pledge our own co-operation in all matters of common concern. To employers and to employees we commend the ideal of such purpose and of such action founded thereon as will inspire a just confidence. That confidence will be born of a truer understanding but it must be nourished and kept alive by the quickening spirit of justice and fair dealing. Upon such confidence must rest in the last analysis the honourable and unfettered co-operation so vital to our national development. The trust and fealty of comradeship can be won if men receive and give a fair deal. Untried in war, Canada stood high among the nations in the organization of her armies. I pray that in the organization of peace activities her effort will not be less worthy nor less outstanding.

The CHAIRMAN: We have with us this morning a member of the Government who accompanied the Prime Minister, and who, with him, was active and energetic in assisting the promotion, preparation, and adoption of the Labour Convention which forms a part of the Peace Treaty. I will not presume to tell you the details of what occurred, and of the difficulties which were faced, and overcome; but will ask the Hon. Mr. Sifton, the member of the Government to whom I refer, to give you such information as he deems advisable and expedient in connection with his work and that of the Prime Minister in Paris, and their efforts in bringing about the adoption of the Labour Convention.

ADDRESS OF HON. A. L. SIFTON.

Hon. A. L. SIFTON: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am pleased indeed to have the opportunity of being here to assist Mr. Robertson in welcoming those who have come here at such great trouble and inconvenience to themselves for the purpose of endeavouring to find the proper solution of the great difficulties which for years have somewhat interfered with the progress and development of their labours.

The special reason why I was asked to be here was for the purpose of saying a few words in regard to the work done in Paris with reference to the International Labour Convention. You have all had copies of that International Labour Convention, which, in its present shape—if it is a necessity, as it was thought to be by a great many people—at least gives to the people of Canada a fair share of equality in such matters. The principal reason why it was thought advisable for Canada to be a party to that Convention was not that it would advance immediately the interests of the labour people of Canada, because labour conditions in Canada were much superior to those of most of the nations who have become parties to the Convention; but it was for the purpose of gradually raising the conditions in countries where such conditions are unequal, because the great argument in Canada has always been that, so far as exportable products are concerned, we have come into competition with the labour people and labour conditions of countries that are very far from being as well advanced in these respects as Canada, and that we were practically bound down to the limits set by those countries, which practically cut off the exportable products of the Dominion of Canada.

The real object of this International Labour Convention, so far as Canada is concerned, is to put the labour conditions of the different countries of the world on an equal footing, thereby gradually raising the labour conditions of Canada without stopping the demand for labour or the demand for the articles produced and incidentally stopping the production of the entire exportable products of Canada. These were the reasons, and practically the only reasons, why Canada should enter into an International Labour Convention —because the conditions in Canada were greatly superior to those existing elsewhere.

Having decided that it was a good thing for Canada to enter into such a Convention, the real trouble began for the members of the Delegation with the first report that was brought in by the International Labour Convention of the World. That was a Delegation selected by the various countries of the world, and up to that time Canada was not represented upon it; and, although we recognized our own importance very largely, and know that we know more about labour questions than any other people in the world, the people in charge of that International Committee did not recognize the importance of Canada in that respect, and put in a clause providing that, although we might send delegates for certain purposes, the representatives of the governments of any of the British Dominions should neither vote nor have a place upon the governing body of that International Convention. It took six weeks of hard work upon the part of the Premier of this country and the gentlemen who assisted him in these matters to convince the authorities of the world—and they are practically the representatives of the five great nations who were taking the principal part—that that report could not possibly be adopted by the people of Canada or any of the other British Dominions. Although we received only passive assistance from the other parts of the British Dominions, being a very long distance away, and being more especially interested in the question of foreign labour than the people of Canada were, it remained for the Prime Minister of Canada, with such assistance as he could get, to bring to the attention of Mr. Lloyd George, Premier Clemenceau, and President Wilson, the fact that under no circumstances would Canada enter into an International Labour Convention except on a basis of absolute equality with every other member of that Convention. I think, Mr. Chairman, that no busier six weeks were ever put in than those following the last week of March, when the printed report was given to the Peace Delegation for the purpose of being passed upon; and it was passed upon, with an amendment proposed by Sir Robert Borden, which we thought would accomplish the purpose, but which even then was refused until the day before the Treaty was presented to the German nation. They were six weeks of the hardest work, the hardest sort of campaigning, that I have ever had the privilege of doing, and I may say that, so far as politeness is concerned, my reputation with the delegates, I fear, has gone forever. But, as I told one of the delegates who practically said I was making myself a nuisance, my reputation for politeness in the city of Paris, where I did not expect to be again for a number of years, was infinitely immaterial compared with giving assistance for the Dominion of Canada, and we would keep up the fight until the Treaty was finally signed by Germany. On the last day we succeeded in our efforts, and now we have an opportunity of appearing at an International Convention on a basis of equality with the other members, and are not put lower than the negroes of Liberia, which, if it had not been for that work, would have been our position in regard to such matters.

I am not going to delay you in regard to this point; it does not matter much about the work that was done or who did it. The real question is the final result. It is a question for the delegates who go to that International Labour Convention whether they will keep up the fight. The fight is not over. Although we recognize our importance, the rest of the world does not, and for years to come there will be opportunities to bring good ideas—good labour ideas and good employers' ideas—from the Dominion of Canada for the benefit of the men who go there. People usually go to International Conventions very largely for what may be called selfish reasons. The idealistic programme that some of us love to adopt does not go far in an International Labour Convention. Most of the delegates go there with the idea of helping their own country; and, although our people are idealistic and would like to help the world at large, it would be well for the delegates who go to these International Labour Conventions to keep in view the fact that they are not going to get much help from the other countries, and that what little time they have to spare they had better devote to looking after the interests of their own country first, and then the interests of the world at large. That is the position that will be taken by all the other delegates, judging from the experience which I have had in these matters up to date. Although they are idealistic in their speeches and in the newspaper press, yet when they come in vote they are not idealistic in regard to other countries, but look after the rights of their

own country. It will be well, therefore, for the delegates from Canada to keep in view the fact that in regard to these matters they must eternally exercise vigilance or they will get no further.

It is the same in regard to the work you are doing here. Although the Government wishes to assist in the labour movement so far as possible; although we have the best Labour Minister that I have had any experience of in connection with the work that was done over there—because there was no Labour delegate in the city of Paris who was in any way his equal in the interest which he took in the Labour movement, and I regret exceedingly that we did not have our minister there—no matter how much he may do, or how much the various idealistic people may wish to help in regard to these matters, it is going to be a question for yourselves. It is going to be a question for the labour people and the employing people to deal with; it is not going to be a question of seeing whether some can pile up millions or whether others can stop their employers making money, but whether you can get together in such a way that the employment of the people of Canada may be of such a nature that the proper results may accrue to the people who do the work, and the proper remuneration may go to the people who manage the business, whether capitalists, millionaires, or poor people struggling along to make a living for themselves and their families. Those are the questions which will have to be left to you. You will have to work together in unity and harmony, and try to solve the question for the Dominion of Canada before you go to an International Labour Conference in order to give them the benefit of your ideas.

The CHAIRMAN: It is our purpose to proceed as rapidly as possible with the business of the Convention; but it perhaps would not be out of place to devote a little time, at the opening session at least, to generalities; and, inasmuch as the House of Commons is in session, and as members of the Government are busy in connection with their Parliamentary duties, and we may not have the opportunity of having them with us continuously, we should hear from some of them now. I would therefore ask the Hon. Mr. Rowell, President of the Privy Council, in the absence of the Prime Minister, to address the Convention briefly, after which we shall have an address from a gentleman whom I think you will all be delighted to hear—a gentleman who for many years has been a close student of labour problems, and who, I think, commands to a great extent the confidence of employers and employees, as an authority by reason of the study of the problems. I refer to the Hon. Mackenzie King, who will follow Mr. Rowell.

ADDRESS OF HON. N. W. ROWELL.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: My place this morning is to detain you but for a few minutes from the opportunity of hearing the gentleman whom you will be delighted to hear. I am looking forward with equal pleasure to hearing this gentleman; therefore I am consulting my own pleasure in detaining you but for a very few minutes.

Reference has been made to the Conference at Paris. We all hope and pray that it will prove the most momentous Conference of modern times in reference to the peace of the world. It was a Peace Conference. Men went there with conflicting ideas, opposed on many points, with the resolution, if possible, to get together, to establish a basis of peace and co-operation; and the Conference would have been a disastrous failure unless they were able to get together and establish a basis of peace. May I say, Mr. Chairman, I look upon this as a Canadian Peace Conference on the most vital problem confronting the people of Canada to-day; and the success or failure of this Conference will depend upon the result, and the country will judge of the size and capacity of the men of all shades of opinion who compose this Conference by the result of the Conference. If men with divergent views at that World Peace Conference could get together—though it took them a long time— and reconcile their differences, men in Canada possessing common Canadian ideals can get together and reconcile their differences for the future.

We have had some aspects of industrial strife in Canada in recent years. They have been more acute during the present year, though not as acute in Canada as in other countries. I think it is to the credit of both employers and employees in Canada that there has been less industrial unrest in Canada during the war and since the war than I believe, in any other nation in the world; and that is a matter for congratulation both to employers and employees. The splendid spirit which the workingmen of Canada displayed throughout the war, the magnificent energy which the employers of Canada put into their work during the war, have given Canada

in the industrial world to-day a status as unique and commanding as that which the work of our soldiers has given Canada on the field of battle. You have before you the largest, the most inspiring, the most responsible, and the most difficult task which you have faced since the war broke out. Our future, our industrial progress, the social conditions and future welfare of the masses of our people, Canada's place as a pioneer in helping to solve the industrial problem by co-operative methods—these will be largely in your keeping during the next day or two. No more responsible and no more inspiring task ever faced a body of representative Canadians than that which faces this group of men to-day; and I am sure the sense of responsibility, the sense of the opportunity, will inspire every man present.

If we cannot make progress along the higher lines of civilization by war between nations, equally we cannot make progress along the higher lines of industrial life and industrial civilization by war among the classes. Each has a place in the industrial life of the nation. One is indispensable to the other. Co-operation should take the place of conflict; not one class dominating over the other, but co-operation with a frank recognition by each of the place of the other; and I have such abounding confidence in my fellow Canadian citizens, both the men who supply the capital and manage the industries and the men who toil, that I have looked forward to this Conference with the greatest expectation that Canada would be a real pioneer in this great enterprise, and that she would set the pace for the other nations of the world. In this high and noble task to which you are summoned I wish you God-speed.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary to make any extended remarks from the Chair in introducing speakers so without any further preliminary introduction of the Hon. Mr. King, I will ask him if he will kindly address the Conference.

ADDRESS OF HON. W. L. MACKENZIE KING.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: may I thank you, Senator Robertson, for your kindness in inviting me to be present at this Conference, and, through you, the Government of Canada for extending the invitation. I should like also to express my very deep appreciation of your exceedingly kind personal references. May I say in all sincerity, that I think the Department of Labour of Canada is to be congratulated in having at its head a man who, like yourself, has a knowledge of industrial questions, wrought out of a life experience, and who, in the method by which he is seeking to discharge his duties has, I think, gained the respect of both employers and employees for the sincerity of his purpose and the earnestness of his endeavour to do what is best for the people of Canada as a whole. I hasten, Sir, to express my deep regret that the Prime Minister is prevented from being present at this gathering to-day, and particularly for the reason which makes it impossible for him to attend. I know I share in the hope of all present that his indisposition may be brief, and that he may soon find it possible to return to the discharge of his public duties.

As I speak at the moment, my thought goes back, Ladies and Gentlemen, to a morning in Italy some twenty years ago, at the completion of a year's travel and study of industrial conditions in Europe, when I received a message from the Post Office at Rome to call for a cable which was waiting for me there. I well remember with what trepidation I went to the Post Office to see what that message contained. To my complete surprise, when I opened it I found it was a wire from the then Postmaster-General of Canada, Sir William Mulock, mentioning that it was the intention of the Government of Canada to start a Department of Labour, and to begin the publication of a Labour Gazette; and the wire was to ask me whether I would be willing to accept the position of editor of that publication. That was twenty years ago. Up to that time my thoughts had been entirely along the lines of an academic career. Shortly after that message was received I was on my way to Ottawa, and shortly after that was searching about in this city for premises in which to commence the work of the organization of the department under the direction of Sir William Mulock.

I well remember those early weeks, and indeed the early years, in the work of organization of the department as a branch of the Federal Government, as it was winning its place among the other departments of the Government. If I refer to this incident it is that I may the better let you appreciate how grateful I feel for the opportunity of again being brought

into touch, through this gathering, with the work of a department with which I had the privilege of being associated pretty intimately for a period of ten years.

In thinking over what it would be appropriate to say on this occasion, I have thought that I should like to link up the few remarks I have to make with the significance of the different words which described this gathering. It is referred to in the agenda as a National Industrial Conference. Each one of those words has, I think, special significance. But before I touch on their individual significance, may I say in regard to the Conference itself that I am whole-heartedly in sympathy with its purpose. May I say, in addition, that I have read over with great interest and care the agenda and the memoranda which have been laid before you, and have been impressed with the care and forethought shown in the preparation of those documents. Certainly the subjects which you are called upon to consider are mighty and comprehensive enough; in fact it would be difficult, as Mr. Rowell has just said, to imagine—with the possible exception of a Treaty of Peace or the formation of a League of Nations—a group of problems which could be more difficult of solution than those which will be presented to this gathering.

In considering the work of the Conference, the important thing as regards ultimate success is the spirit in which the whole subject of industrial relations is to be approached; and it is of that spirit act I should like to say a few words.

First of all, in regard to the significance of the word "National." I take it, Mr. Chairman, that this word raises the deliberations of this Assembly above the level of anything in the nature of political party controversy. Unless the questions which come before this gathering can be dealt with in other than a party spirit, little can be hoped for in the way of permanent achievement. It is undoubtedly true that in the ultimate solution of the great problems which concern the well-being of the people of this country, party policies will have to have their place; and it may be that in the endeavour to make some of those policies prevail there will inevitably be bitter party conflict, because men cannot be expected to see eye to eye on many of the great public social issues; but I think that this Conference would be well advised if it were to devote its attention, not so much to the matters which go to make for party differences as to those many other problems—and they are large enough—on which it is possible to find a common ground as between the different political parties, in working out what is best in the solution of industrial questions. In this connection, I think that plenty of material and opportunity will be afforded in considering the first item on the agenda: "Consideration of the labour features of the Treaty of Peace".

I had the privilege, at the National Liberal Convention recently held, of introducing a resolution recommending that the Liberal Party accept in their entirety, in the spirit in which they had been framed, and in so far as the special circumstances of Canada would permit, the terms of the Labour Convention, and general principles associated with the League of Nations, and incorporated in the conditions of peace, this motion was unanimously adopted, and thoses features are a part of the Liberal platform to-day.

I think the Prime Minister claims a degree of authorship, and some of his followers, are ready to concede to him the exclusive authorship, of the terms of the Labour Convention. Be the degree of authorship what it may, I think we may say that as respects the adhesion to those principles and approval of them, the political parties of this country split about even. Inasmuch as the Treaty is before Parliament at the present time, and has already been approved by both political parties, the principles set out in the Labour Convention attached to the League of Nations, may, I think, be regarded as having met with the approval of both the political parties in Canada. A purpose of this Conference, and the great work of this Conference, will be to show the public men, on both sides of politics, how these principles can be given most effective application in the industrial affairs of the country. That is one of the the first points suggested by the word "National".

Another thought which, it seems to me, is suggested by the use of the word "National", is that this discussion should have regard for the well-being of the whole rather than the special interests of any particular group. I think we may thank God that in the discussions which you are likely to have on these social and economic questions there is no danger of the discussion being degraded by appeals to racial or religious prejudice. When we come to a consideration of social

and economic questions we strike a stratum which run through all differences of race and religion; that stratum however, is itself pretty much of a conglomerate, in which the different elements composing it are still pretty distinctly marked. If in this gathering the emphasis is going to be put upon the differences which arise out of class interest or class feeling, very little will be achieved in the way of ultimate good. It is not by emphasizing differences of interest, but by seeing the larger interest held in common that you must be able to make a contribution of value to our national economy. Undoubtedly it will be necessary in discussions here for those who represent labour interests to express their views very strongly. It will be equally important for those representing the interest of capital to express very strongly the position as they see it; but the success of this gathering will depend not upon the emphasis that is put upon the differences that you have, but rather upon the degree of endeavour to reach the common ground on which there can be union and reconciliation of differences between the different groups. If the word "National" has a further significance, I think it will be found in particular reference to the second feature on the agenda, namely: "Consideration of the question of the desirability of unifying and co-ordinating the existing labour laws of the Dominion Parliament and of the Provincial Legislatures." In giving some study to this question of industrial relations nothing has appealed so strongly to me as the necessity, if any kind of permanent improvement is to be made, of bringing about an equality of the standards in industry over the areas in which there is industrial competition. It has seemed to me, in this connection, that there is something in industry which approaches the law laid down by Gresham in regard to the precious metals. You know that Gresham, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, discovered that where two kinds of metals were in circulation, one of a higher degree of quality than the other, though both of the same nominal value, the baser metal tended to drive the purer one out of circulation; that men hoarded, or used in foreign exchanges the metal of better quality, and put in circulation only the metal of baser quality. Well, it is exactly the same in the matter of competing standards in industry.

In this great Dominion of ours, if some provinces are going to have a high level of industrial standards and other provinces are not willing to approach to that high level, then the provinces which have high industrial standards are going to be handicapped by the provinces that maintain standards at a lower level. Wherever a lower standard is brought into competition with a higher, and men are actuated primarily by selfish, material motives displaying a willingness to sacrifice human life or health for commercial gain, there inevitably the employer or the province that is trying to do the right thing and the best thing may be permanently handicapped by the employer or the province that is unwilling to come up to the higher standard. Lower standards tend to drag the higher down to their level. To maintain proper standards, they must be made equal in significance over all competing areas. So I think that one of the greatest services this gathering can render will be to emphasize the necessity that throughout the whole of this Dominion of Canada we have such uniformity of standards in our industrial regulations that the provinces that are behind the line, if there are any, will be brought up to the level of all the others, and one standard made to prevail so far as may be possible, having regard to differences of conditions in the different provinces.

The importance of what may be described as a law of competing standards in industry will, I think, have to be taken into account, and will become more apparent, as you begin to discuss other items on the Agenda, and particularly items three and four, which deal with such questions as hours of labour and minimum wage, because there you are brought immediately into the air not merely of interprovincial competition, but also of international competition. There, it seems to me, lies the justification for, and the strongest argument that can be urged in support of, having some such permanent organization as is contemplated by the Labour Convention, which is a part of the League of Nations. If the countries of the world that have high standards today are to maintain these standards against the competition of nations which have lower standards, it will only be by bringing the nations throughout the world that share in industrial competition up to a common level in the matter of industrial standards.

May I venture, just as showing my entire sympathy with the purpose of the Labour

Convention, which I think is a very far-reaching and important one, to quote a passage which I wrote while the war was in progress, and which appears in a book on industrial reconstruction, issued before the war was ended and before the Armistice was declared. On page 353 of that book, speaking of the principles underlying health in industry, and the necessity for the maintenance of proper labour standards, I have the following paragraph:

> It is not a National Minimum only, but an International Minimum which is needed, if labour standards are to be protected against the undermining effects of the Law of Competing Standards, operating through international competition. The possible creation of some international agency to further the establishment and enforcement of international conventions aimed at the maintenance of an International Minimum, is a subject of momentous concern. It is well deserving of consideration in any discussion pertaining to a League of Nations which may constitute a part of the peace negotiations at the conclusion of the War.

So, Mr. Sifton, I need hardly say to you that in taking the part which you and your colleagues did at the Peace Convention, in seeking to have Canada given full representation in a Convention of that kind, and urging it with all the force and ability at your command, you have rendered this country a very real and important service.

Now, as to that which is suggested by the second word in the name of this Conference. It is not a National Conference merely, but a National Industrial Conference; and that raises at once the significance of the word "industrial". If this Conference is to achieve what is expected of it in relation to industry, it must have a proper appreciation of what "industry" is, and who the parties to industry are.

Industry, as I conceive it, is the means whereby the material resources of the world are transformed through human energy and human intelligence, with the aid of natural powers, tools and machines, into services and commodities available for human use. In that vast process of transformation, itself made up of a multitude of interrelated transforming processes, the abilities and talents and energies of men and women of all classes are combined in a manner which in this age of world-wide industrial expansion encompasses practically the entire globe.

When you begin to ask yourself who the parties are that contribute to industry, you will find, I think, that they are in reality, not one or two, but four; and it is of the four that I should like to say just a few words. We are accustomed very often in discussions to refer only to capital and labour, as though the whole problem of industry were bound up exclusively with the interests of those two classes. I think it is important that we should seek greater accuracy in describing the parties who contribute to the work of industry as a whole.

First of all, there is Labour, which supplies the mental and the muscular energy necessary to effect the processes of immediate transformation.

Then there is Capital. Capital is necessary to provide the raw materials, the tools, machines, appliances and equipment essential to industrial processes, and the advances in the way of food, clothing and shelter, required by Labour pending the distribution of the finished product.

But, in addition to Labour and Capital, you have to have some agent, or means by which these two contributing parties may be brought into a relationship which is effective in the work of production, and those who perform that service perform what is known as the service of management or directing ability. I think the service of the manager in industry is a service which should be kept separate and distinct from the services rendered either by Labour, as we commonly term it, or Capital, as we commonly term it. Owing to the fact that many men who are possessors of capital are also managers of business, we have come to think of management and capital as being one and the same thing; but if you stop for a moment you will see that the two are entirely different. An infant in arms, whose inheritance may be held in trust, may be a capitalist and may supply the capital that is necessary to carry on some branch of industry. Capital is in the nature of a contribution of material substances. It is a contribution in wealth which may be stored and hoarded. The services of the industrial manager are of an entirely different nature. They are services of an intellectual kind, services of a type which cannot be described in terms of substances or dollars, but which are of the very highest order of human intelligence. I believe we shall get to a nearer and truer solution of the industrial questions only as we see that the services of the industrial manager are kept separate and distinct in the minds of all parties concerned, from the service of Capital and Labour, all important and necessary as these services are.

But, while Labour and Capital can do little or nothing of themselves, unless they are united under the guiding genius of management, so neither Capital nor Labour

nor management can do anything apart from the services which the Community as a whole render; and it is the Community, as a fourth party to industry, that I think needs greater consideration in these times than it has ever had in the past.

Stop and think of it, if you will, ladies and gentlemen. What could any of these factors in industry do apart from the services which are rendered by organized society in one form or another?

The vaster industrial organization becomes, the more it depends, in a multitude of directions, upon the investments of the Community.

It is the Community which provides the natural resources and powers that underlie all production. Individuals may acquire title by one means or another, but it is from the Community, and with the consent of the Community, that titles are held. It is the Community, organized in various ways, which maintains government and foreign relations, secures law and order, fosters the arts and inventions, aids education, breeds opinion, and promotes, through concession or otherwise, the agencies of transportation, communication, credit, banking, and the like, without which any production, save the most primitive, would be impossible. It is the Community which creates the demand for commodities and services, through which Labour is provided with remunerative employment, and Capital with a return upon its investment. Apart from the Community, inventive genius, organizing capacity, managerial or other ability would be of little value. Turn where one may, it is the Community that makes possible all the activities of industry, and helps to determine their value and scope. This being the case, any policies with regard to industrial matters which ignore the rights of the Community are far from being a satisfactory solution of the industrial question.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, if you agree that there are four parties to industry and that these four parties are not only interrelated, but also interdependent, then let me ask you this question: Is not each of the four entitled to some voice in the control of industry and the shaping of industrial policy?

Does the organization of industry as it exists at the present time adequately express that right to a community of control? I think, as we look at the organization of industry to-day we see that it is far too much organized from the point of view, not of all four parties, but of only one; it is too much in the nature of a monopoly of control, and that a monopoly of control on the part of capital. Look at the organization of industry as for the most part it is at the present time. Capital investors choose the directors of Industrial Boards. The directors choose the managers. The managers manage the business from the point of view of the directors and the capital investors. Where is the representation of labour? Where is the representation of management as a separate entity? Where is the representation of the community?

Now I do not suggest that all four parties are to be represented in exactly the same way. There is for example a control exercised by the community through its representatives in Parliament. There is a control exercised by the community through such organizations as the Railway Commission and Boards of that kind, all of which have a controlling influence in the matter of industrial relations. Labour where it is permitted joint agreements, exercises a control in the terms agreed to. But, if we are going to bring about the industrial peace and the industrial progress which we hope will come in this new era, it will not be by holding, even in the matter of form, to a kind of organization in industry which is entirely out of harmony with the political organization of the state.

In the olden days there was an idea that the state could be governed only by one of the parties to it. King John was a type of government of his day. He thought that only the King had the right to shape the policy of the country. Not the working classes, but the lords and nobles came to him and said: "You must sign a charter setting forth our rights in the matter of citizenship." A great advance was made in the progress of constitutional government when that charter was signed.

Coming down to 1265, in the Parliament of Simon de Montfort, there you had assembled together a representative body not unlike the very gathering assembled in this room. All classes in the state were represented—the common citizens as well as the lords and the nobles and the King, all gathering together as a representative assembly for the purpose of working out common policies and common aims.

This gathering here, to my mind, has a significance that it is impossible to put into words. It is only by bringing together, as there are brought together here, representatives of Labour, representatives of Capital, representatives of Management and representatives of the Community or the State, and working together from the point of view of the interest of all concerned, that it will be possible to work out a solution of the

great industrial questions of our times. If you need any thought to inspire you in your efforts, it should lie in the fact that of all achievements of which human genius has been capable the greatest has been the creation of the British Constitution. That Constitution has worked down from an autocracy to a broad democracy, precept by precept, line upon line, here a little, there a little, through give and take on the part of the different elements composing political society. You, ladies and gentlemen, assembled here to-day, representing the different elements that go to make up our industrial society, have it within your power to lay the foundations of an industrial parliament which should go far to help to solve the social and industrial problems of our day.

What the British Constitution stands for in the government of the State, we should aim at effecting in the working out of a constitution for industry. It will not all be accomplished within a day; neither need it be the work of generations. With free political institutions our one great inheritance, the application to industry of those principles which underlie government within the State should be neither impossible nor difficult. A willingness to recognize the justice of them, and to act in the light of knowledge we already have, is all that is necessary.

It is not monopoly of control in any form that we must seek to bring about in this period of transition, but a gradual evolution into a system of joint control, whereby each of the parties to industry will be afforded a voice in the determination of the terms and conditions upon which its services to industry are rendered.

Now let me conclude with just one further thought and that a reference to the last word in the designation of this gathering: the significance of the word "Conference."

There are only two ways in which changes can be brought about: either by an appeal to Reason, or by an appeal to Force. The appeal to Reason is the method of conference; it is the method which we have accepted in our Parliaments; it is the method which we have adopted in our courts as a means of establishing right as between disputing parties. The other method, the method of Force, might be described as the Prussian method, the method of war, and the method of anarchy. As between these two methods, there is no alternative. The problems of Labour and Capital have to be solved either by deliberation, by methods which time and experience have proved to be the only effective ones, or they must be left to a condition of anarchy and war, which can never effect a satisfactory solution in a matter of right on any question. So let the first thought in the minds of this gathering be an appreciation of the significance of the opportunity which lies before it at this time.

It was, I think, on May 24, 1916, that Sir Edward Grey, now Viscount Grey, and British Ambassador to the United States, said: "I care not how often I say it, this war could have been avoided by accepting a conference. Why was the conference not accepted? Because there was no good-will." What a momentous thought is given expression to in those words! And yet how true it is! And how equally true it is of conditions in industry.

Industrial strife, industrial war, have their origin in precisely the same spirit and kind of methods as occasion international wars. Throw your thought back over the great industrial conflicts, those of you who have been engaged in them, and ask yourself the question, whether in your heart of hearts you do not believe that had both sides been willing to enter into conference, to sit down with an attitude of good-will, to look for the common ground that unites rather than the differences that separate, the particular strife we have in mind could not have been averted? It is so, I believe, of all disputes, in the past. It will be equally so of all disputes that may arise in the future. In these days, when the condition throughout the world is what it is, any man or any group of men, who are unwilling to enter into conference for the sake of avoiding strife—I do not care who the party or parties may be—any man who is unwilling to enter into conference for the sake of helping to make a position rightfully understood is a public menace and should receive no consideration from society. I say that equally of any leader of labour or any captain of industry. The greater the man, the greater the offence. Conference does not necessarily mean meeting all demands, or obtaining all demands, but it does afford opportunity for the statement of a position, and of giving to the public, the fourth party to industry, an intelligent appreciation of what is fundamental in differences between contending parties. The public is entitled to that consideration, and the man who is unprepared and unwilling to give it, is helping to plant hatred in the

breasts of his fellows, and to sow the seeds of anarchy, and is, in no sense of the word, a worthy citizen of his country, in days such as these.

William James, in one of his books, speaks of a certain blindness in human beings: it is a blindness which afflicts all of us in greater or less degree: the inability to see into others' lives and appreciate what are their interests, their feelings, their aims, their needs, and their aspirations. All of us are busy men. Each of us has certain things that claim his attention. All of us are kept thinking from day to day on matters that are very vital to ourselves. But these things which are vital to ourselves are also vital secrets which others do not discover, and which others cannot understand until they approach us in an attitude of sympathy and good-will. The unwillingness to look into other lives, to put one's self in the position of other men and women, lies at the root of all the intolerance of our day—intolerance in religion, intolerance in matters of race, intolerance in matters of politics, intolerance above all, in these industrial questions. It is only as every man or every woman seeks to look into the other person's position and to see what it is that he or she has to contend with, and what it is that he or she has to consider, and attempts to view that thing sympathetically, that any real approach will be made in the solution of industrial questions. It is that spirit which must guide this assembly. Those of you who are employers of labour seek to appreciate what is said by men who speak out of a long and bitter experience, and who have shared the trials of those who are struggling day and night to make a living for themselves and their families; and you, workingmen, must equally consider the anxiety, the care, and the forethought of men and women who are saving their incomes for the purpose of investing in industry, and of the problems of employers who are seeking to preserve the organization of industry in times of stress and strain, often saving it from utter rack and ruin. If you approach the subject from this point of view you will be able to find common ground enough on which to unite in laying down policies and principles and practices which would be of lasting service to our country.

Ladies and Gentlemen, you have a great opportunity, I believe; an opportunity unequalled by that of any body of men or women, save corresponding groups, in any part of the world.

You have witnessed millions of men lay down their lives that freedom might be preserved throughout the world. It is yours to make possible that larger freedom for which they fought and died; it is yours to realize the vision of the heroic dead and to give this world that larger measure of human liberty and enjoyment of human happiness for which they sacrificed their lives. Yours it is to create a constitution for industry, to establish those customs, agreements, and practices which, governing in industrial relations, will safeguard society in the realm of industry, just as our political constitution safeguards the interests of society in the State.

In addition to all that, you have it in your power to put into industry a new spirit, and to help create throughout this Dominion a new conception of the real significance of industry itself. Too much in the past have we thought of industry as in the nature or a revenue-producing process by which some men by economic right or might have been able to arrest a portion of the total output in the form of wages, and by which other men by economic right or might have been able to arrest their portion of the total output in the form of profits. In the conflicts that this has engendered we have lost sight altogether of the fact that industry if it stands for anything at all, stands for service to the whole of human society; that, in the last analysis, it is in the nature of social service, and social service of the very highest order, since upon the existence of industry depends the possible performance of all other classes of service in society.

Let me suggest that you keep before you this larger thought of the social service which industry is capable of rendering. Now that we have started on a new era of peace, let service in industry, industrial service, become the moral equivalent of military service in times of war. Let us honour the men and women who make their contribution to industry, whether it be in the nature of capital investment or of labour investment. Let us see in such a contribution a service to society as a whole; and let us not forget that whoever serves society it is the duty of society to protect.

While wealth and dollars may be much in themselves, they are not all. In the relation of human lives to the material interests of industry let us remember that, precious as gold may be, there is nothing so precious as human life. Where the material interests of industry conflict with the well-being of

human lives; when it comes, if it ever does come, to a conflict between the claims of humanity and the claims of industry, remember that industry exists for the sake of humanity, and not humanity for the sake of industry.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that every delegate present at this Conference feels that the time spent this morning has been well spent in listening to the gentlemen who have spoken and to the message sent by the Prime Minister to the Conference, and that the thoughts that have been projected for the consideration of the Conference by the gentlemen who have spoken will merit and will receive careful consideration.

Before entering upon the consideration of the questions that have been submitted, the Committee that made the arrangements for this gathering felt that it would be interesting to the delegates present, and useful in enabling them to arrive at conclusions, to know something of the facts surrounding the industrial conditions and industrial problems as they exist in sister countries with whom our commerce is largely interchanged. We have therefore with us this morning a gentleman who has been kind enough to come from the Motherland to address this Conference for a short time concerning industrial problems as they exist to-day in England and the methods and the efforts that are being made to cope with them. This gentleman was for years a large employer of labour; I think he had under his jurisdiction and control something like 5,000 workmen. He is pretty well known to Canadian employers and employees because of the fact that during the war he resided in Canada and contributed in a large way during that time to the building up of the munitions industry of this country. Since the war ended he returned to England, and he has been gratuitously giving his time and energy to the study of industrial problems as they now exist in that country, in the hope of helping to arrive at some solution.

I have great pleasure in introducing Colonel Carnegie, of London, England.

ADDRESS OF COL. D. CARNEGIE.

COLONEL D. CARNEGIE: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I appreciate most highly the honour of being asked to tell you something about the progress of Whitley Councils in Great Britain. At the same time I am conscious of no small responsibility in trying to place before you a complete and fair estimate of their value to industry from the standpoint of both employer and employed. The information I have been able to obtain has been afforded to me through the courtesy of the Minister of Labour and other officials in England.

I propose referring:

First, to the causes leading to the formation of Whitley Councils.

Second, to the application of Whitley Councils to industry.

Third, to the attitude of employers and employed to Whitley Councils.

Fourth, to the progress of Whitley Councils.

CONDITIONS LEADING TO THE FORMATION OF WHITLEY COUNCILS.

Mr. Whitley, the Deputy Speaker of the British House of Commons, would be the last to claim that by the genius of his committee only the Whitley Councils have been established.

Long before the British Government appointed the Whitley Committee in 1917, to consider the relations between employers and employed, a strong public opinion had been aroused against the repeated industrial disturbances caused by strikes. In 1911 British strikes became a serious public menace; the machinery of voluntary conciliation boards established in 1896 proved inadequate; labour was accused of breaking agreements; some people suggested that compulsory arbitration and conciliation, as had been enacted in New Zealand and in Canada, should be made law in Britain. Instead, however, an Industrial Council was appointed in 1912, consisting of equal numbers of representatives of capital and labour under the chairmanship of Sir George Askwith (now Lord Askwith) to investigate the subject of collective agreements. Compulsory enforcement of voluntary contracts was not recommended by the council, on the ground that it would weaken "the moral force of the obligation," and little was done to improve the ordinary voluntary conciliation boards.

The attitude of labour against any form of compulsory arbitration in England had steadily increased. In 1914, just prior to the war, industrial disputes grew in number. In the month of May there were actually 140 disputes. Suspicion and strife inside the ranks of both labour unions and employers' associations, in addition to hostility between employers and employed, had also increased, making co-operation appear almost impossible. The increasing number of different sects among labour reformers, each composed of a few earnest leaders, unselfish

and lovable when they buried their hobbies, but intolerable when they brought them out, added to the complexity of the whole problem.

After the outbreak of war an industrial truce was made between capital and labour for the duration of the war. The result of the truce inspired faith in the possibility of obtaining a workable plan of co-operation between employers and employed. Different institutions, press, and public advocated humanizing relations between capital and labour. Many schemes were proposed; commissions sat on the subject; foundations investigated the problem; reports and recommendations were made by social, industrial and other organizations. From the employers' organizations came manifestos and recommendations in 1916 and 1917. A builders' national parliament was proposed by Mr. Malcolm Sparks in 1916. In the same year the Garton Foundation proposed plans for better industrial relations between capital and labour and the British Trades Union Congress passed a comprehensive set of proposals, but no plans of co-operation with employers were formulated.

The Whitley Committee, taking advantage of all the information which had been prepared on the subject, issued their report and recommended a change in the vast industrial machine, which to many looked like inviting disaster. The Whitley report, however, was approved by the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress, by different trade unions, and by a number of employers' associations.

THE APPLICATION OF WHITLEY COUNCILS TO INDUSTRY.

The next important inquiry was how Whitley Councils could be applied to industry. Questions arose as to how far the British Government could father the committee's plans, or whether the propaganda work should be left to the associations of employers and labour unions. It was ultimately decided that the Ministry of Labour should undertake the propaganda work. This was done by a body of well trained officials who have shown great capacity. As a rule, the officials conferred with the leaders of labour unions and employers' associations, and if a desire was expressed by them for a meeting to discuss the matter, meetings would be arranged between the representatives of both labour and employers' unions and an opportunity would be afforded for the formation of Whitley Councils.

In all their propaganda work the officials of the Ministry have avoided the very appearance of coercion in the formation of these councils. Their tact, intelligence and good sense have won for them the esteem and praise of the leaders of industry. After a Whitley Council is formed it is usual for a representative of the Ministry of Labour to be asked to attend the Council meetings.

THE ATTITUDE OF SECTIONS OF LABOUR AND CAPITAL TO WHITLEY COUNCILS.

Referring now to the attitude of Labour and Capital to Whitley Councils, it would be vain to suppose that organizations brought into existence so rapidly and for such important objects would be accepted without opposition. Mr. Whitley does not claim that he has found the cure-all for industrial unrest. The attitude of both employers and employed towards Whitley Councils varies considerably. Some sections of labour are as strongly opposed to these Councils as other sections are in favour of them. The same can be said with regard to the attitude of employers.

Some labour leaders, while not condemning Whitley Councils, consider that the machinery of their own trade unions can procure for labour all that Whitley Councils can obtain. There are others who say that to join Whitley Councils would shackle their independence and weaken their fighting ability for the rights and liberties they believe they can obtain by standing aloof from union with employers. There are other groups of labour leaders who contend that Whitley Councils do not afford labour that share in the control and responsibility and profits of industry to which they claim a right.

Most of these objections come from what is often called the aristocracy of labour. Officials of long-established trade unions have been trained for years to fight the leaders of employers' associations. It is therefore most difficult for these men to give way to more conciliatory means of settlement. They have a profound conviction that they can settle their differences best by a good fight, and are rather proud of their skill in fighting.

Other small groups of what are known as "small intellectuals," with strong social-istic tendencies, inside the ranks of trade unions, are strongly opposed to Whitley Councils, as they believe they are organized by employers to throw dust in the eyes of the workers and destroy trade unionism.

During the past two years National Federations of skilled labour have been formed. In some cases it would be impossible to elect from the Federation suitable representation on Whitley Councils until they are more consolidated. The officials are not indifferent to the value of such councils; but, owing to the difficulties in settling amicably lines of demarcation between different unions, proportional representation cannot be obtained.

THE ATTITUDE OF EMPLOYEES TO WHITLEY COUNCILS.

A very common attitude among employers who are opposed to Whitley Councils is that they feel quite able to settle any difference between themselves and their employees without the aid of a council. Other employers who have had happy relations with their employees for years consider that existing conciliation boards afford all that is required to maintain these relations. Such employers, however, overlook the fact that Whitley Councils, in addition to providing means of conciliation and good-will, provide for constructive effort in production, which none of the organizations for the settlement of hours and wages provide. It is not uncommon to hear employers who do not favour Whitley Councils say "there are far too many committee meetings of all sorts, which instead of helping production and increasing prosperity, interfere with the progress of the business.

Complaints are made that these councils are absorbing the time of leading employers which should be devoted to their business. Men are taken from their employment who are required in the workshop. Some employers argue that Whitley Councils are obviously more attractive to the workmen, who prefer them to manual work.

The attitude of other employers is that of open hostility to Whitley Councils, because they fear they are the thin edge of the wedge by labour to control industry and displace capital.

Other employers, who have suffered during the war through irksome government control, are opposed to Whitley Councils because they are being fathered by the British Government and are afraid of interference and restrictions resulting.

Some employers contend that because Whitley Councils have no statutory powers their proceedings are of little practical value.

Some employers as well as employees object to Whitley Councils because they contend that anti-social action by the collusion of members is possible, because the consumer is not represented. Such a possibility, however, is extremely remote.

PROGRESS OF WHITLEY COUNCILS IN INDUSTRY.

Turning to the actual progress made by Whitley Councils in industry, I think it is fair to say that it has been considerable.

Since January 11, 1918, when the first council was formed, 41 different industries have established Whitley Councils, in which approximately 2½ million workers are employed. Whitley Councils are voluntary bodies. All the industries in which councils have been formed are well organized; they are principally minor industries, but the two largest, the building and wool and allied textiles, have respectively 553,000 and 191,500 workers.

These councils are grouped in three classes: National, District, and Works. District Councils are being formed or already set up in 19 different industries. Works Committees are being formed in 9 different industries. Each council voices the needs of the national industry of which it is an organized part. The British Government has recognized them as advisory bodies through which the claims of industry are made known. The members of council are elected in equal numbers by the unions of Labour and associations of employers in the industry. No non-union labour is allowed representation on these councils. The highly-organized unions of labour and employers' associations in England made this course not only desirable but essential to success, it being considered that the non-union labourer could voice only his own view and be responsible as an individual for any agreement he made. The mobile nature of labour also made the security of non-union labour agreements between employers and employees uncertain. Organized labour, on the other hand, gave more stability to industry in matters of agreement, although some employers could not depend on agreements made by organized labour, because the leading officials of unions could not always keep an effective control over some of the extreme members of their unions.

Each Whitley Council is thoroughly constituted, having functions great or small as the organizations concerned choose to make them, the principal objects being to consider problems of the workers and improvements in production.

In addition to their formation in ordinary industries, Whitley Councils are being established in Government departments, the Civil Service, by municipal and local non-trading authorities, the teaching, musical, banking, and other professions.

The greatest service Whitley Councils have rendered to industry is in the creation of a new attitude by employers and employed to each other, out of which co-operation instead of hostility has grown. This new spirit has prevented strikes, has increased production, and has improved conditions of labour. Labour men whose names were anathema to employers, and leading employers who were condemned by labour as cruel oppressors for selfish gain, have met each other for the first time around the conference table, and found that in each other common sympathies and qualities that have gradually melted suspicion and inspired co-operation.

Nothing has impressed me so much in regard to the future of industry as the discussions between employers and employees at different Whitley Councils—discussions conducted with a determination to discover what is fair in the interest of both parties. As a rule the representatives of Whitley Councils are men with mature judgment who have been chosen by their unions of labour and associations of employers because of their experience in handling big questions in industry. No resolution is carried at a council meeting unless it has been approved by a majority of the members present on each side of the council, and each constitution fixes the number forming a quorum.

Time will not permit me to give more than a brief outline of the kind of service these councils have performed:

It is not uncommon at council meetings to find discussions on the subject of increased production, and the difficulties of competition, both domestic and foreign. At one meeting I attended, the chairman, who was one of the employers, gave statistics showing the progress made by the industry during the year, and showed that competition from outside sources was so keen that the industry was likely to suffer unless increased production could be obtained or some restriction placed upon the importation of the articles in question. A free discussion followed during which it was contended by one of the labour representatives that one of the most important reasons for suspicion in industry was the absence of information regarding the actual cost of production, prices of materials, and selling prices of articles which are kept by the employers. It was pointed out that as trade union representatives they did not wish to obtain trade secrets, but they believed it would remove suspicion and encourage increased production if they were informed more fully as to the profits of business. One spokesman stated that no workman would ask for higher wages or a reduction of hours if on examination of the facts it was shown that an increase of wages or a reduction of hours would jeopardize the interests of the business and the community. After considerable discussion it was ultimately decided, on the recommendation of one of the employers, that they were prepared to disclose information regarding the cost of production and selling prices, not as individual manufacturers, but through their association as a whole. The spirit of the discussion and the sympathetic interest taken by the labour representatives in the difficulties of the employers was very marked.

In many of the industries in which councils have been formed, it has been decided to give the workmen who have been employed for a continuous period in any year one week's holidays with pay. In listening to the discussions on this matter one could not but feel impressed with the value of employers and employed meeting face to face and discussing requests for improved conditions in the factory and the willingness of employers to do anything within reason to make labour happy and contented.

At another meeting I attended, the chairman, who was one of the employers, pointed out that their industry, in which both sides were interested, was suffering from the importation of articles at a lower price than they could profitably put them on the market. He said that unless some action was taken by the council the industry would suffer. He suggested that a resolution be sent to the Government asking that an embargo be placed upon the importation of the articles in question. He invited discussion, when one of the labour representatives said: "I have been a Trade Unionist for years, and every one who knows me believes that I would do anything to help the industry, but I am a citizen first and I will not support a resolution calling for an embargo on the articles referred to. I know that the wages paid in the country where the articles are manufactured are lower than in this country, and the hours

worked per day are longer. I suggest, therefore, that further inquiry be made before considering the resolution." A very profitable discussion followed, showing that the workingmen were capable of entering into an economic situation of no small importance, and also of appreciating the real difficulties of competition in business.

I could multiply illustrations showing the value to employers and employed of conference at council meetings. The atmosphere created and which is passed on to the district councils and to the workshops, is of greater value than the actual machinery of organization. All kinds of subjects relating to wages, overtime rates, piecework rates, hours of work, apprenticeship, education, statistics and research, organization, propaganda and publicity work are being considered and settled amicably all the time by these Councils.

Questions as to factory organization, safety appliances, and other matters have been referred to Whitley Councils by the Government for their consideration and advice. Already sub-committees of Whitley Councils have investigated and reported upon the subject of housing for the workers; the cost of living and its relation to wages; hours of labour; unemployment insurance; improved methods of production and means of securing trade. In fact, there is hardly a question concerning industry that has not been considered by Whitley Councils.

In cases where a Council has failed to come to a decision, the subject has been referred for arbitration to the Wages and Arbitration Department of the Ministry of Labour.

Several Councils have devised machinery for dealing with disputes and for undertaking conciliation duties. The principle adopted in some cases is that such questions should be dealt with by shop or works' committees or by district councils where possible, the National Council confining itself to questions affecting the whole industry. Some Whitley Councils, such as in the "heavy chemicals" and "road transportation" industries have appointed travelling arbitration panels.

Whitley Councils meet as a rule monthly, but more frequently if necessity requires. The place of meeting is decided by the Council and is arranged to suit the convenience of the members. Some committees meet more frequently. At National Council meetings, district or local matters are discussed if referred to them by Works' Committees or District Councils.

Constitutions have been prepared setting forth the objects and methods of procedure of works committees. As a rule, one or more directors of a company, with heads of departments represent the employers' side, and an equal number of men are elected by their unions to represent the workers.

Works Committees usually meet at regular intervals of two to four weeks, the meeting being held during working hours. Any grievance may be reported by any of the workers to their representative on the Committee, and if their representative cannot himself reach a settlement in the matter, it may be referred to the Committee itself. Works Committees in one form or another existed long before the war and are not in any way the result of suggestions of the Whitley Committee. All expenses of these Councils are shared equally by Labour Unions and Employer's Associations.

I would like to say, in conclusion, that the general impression I have formed in regard to Whitley Councils, from personal observations at different Council meetings and many interviews on the subject with leading employers of labour and leaders of labour unions, is that in spite of their limitations and the objections raised to them by sections of Labour and Capital, they have proved the best means yet devised for bringing together masters and men of the same industry for serious discussion and mutual help. The facts of their progress are indisputable: there is something, call it what one may, that has broken down suspicion and inspired mutual confidence and conference between employers and employed where these Councils have been established.

The big strikes which have taken place in Britain recently are in industries where no Whitley Councils have been established.

It is commonly understood that the conditions of Canadian industry are to-day not quite comparable with those in Britain; but the causes of industrial unrest are the same. Employers who have sympathetically studied the worker's position and labour leaders who with the same attitude have sought to know the employer's responsibilities and difficulties, agree that the solution of the problem of unrest cannot be found in any machinery of organization

only. The problems are human and not mechanical.

In Canada employers and employees are not so highly organized as in the United Kingdom. It is estimated that the percentage of organized labour to the total population in Britain is twelve per cent and in Canada six per cent, approximately.

Then, again, the physical differences due to the great stretches of Canadian territory, the widely scattered industries, the more extreme climatic conditions in Canada than in Britain, and the large percentage of alien labour in Canada, are all factors that should not be overlooked. These physical differences inspire temperamental differences. In Canada the process of change from the position of employee to that of employer is more rapid than in England. Any plans, whether similar to the Whitley Councils or not, which bring together employers and employed to improve the conditions of the workers and encourage increased production, cannot fail to bring national prosperity. The feeling among workers has existed too long that any privileges, recognition, and better conditions have been wrung out of the employers when the forces of labour have prevailed. Such feelings have not inspired increased production.

Labour is calling for better conditions with more comforts, to which employers agree they have a perfect claim. These cannot be obtained without increased production.

I do not profess to have set forth fully all the advantages of Whitley Councils in the limited time at my disposal, but as a student of the subject only, I have tried to give an impartial view. Having served in the workshops and also as an employer of labour, I have had fellowship with workers and employers in their desires for better conditions, fuller responsibility and more adequate rewards. My experience leads me to believe that through Whitley Councils or similar organizations in Canadian industry, where adaptable, better relations between employers and employed will result.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure we are deeply indebted to Col. Carnegie for his visit to Canada to deliver this address, which, together with all other addresses that have been made this morning, is being recorded, and will be placed in your hands, to read at your leisure.

Although Canada interchanges very much of her commerce with the Homeland, yet there is another nation, our neighbour, one of the most important nations of the world industrially, with which we have very important commercial relations. Immediately when we meet again this afternoon at 2.30, we shall listen to an address from a gentleman who has been closely connected with the work of the United States War Labour Board, and who can, and will, I think, bring a message of deep interest to us all.

The Committee on Arrangements will have a recommendation or report to lay before us this afternoon respecting the hours of meeting and the procedure, etc., by which, if the recommendation is adopted by the Conference, we shall be governed. I may say that the proposal as to the hours of meeting is to adjourn at 12.30 and meet again at 2.30. There is therefore not time to have another address before luncheon.

Our enterprising moving-picture people desire that a moving picture of the members attending this Conference should be obtained, because it will be of great interest throughout the whole country, and possibly in other countries. Therefore, it is asked that as we retire from this Chamber, upon adjournment, instead of going out the front door of this building, by which you came in, we should all leave by the door immediately to the left of the entrance of this room. It is requested that the members of the Federal Government and the representatives from the various Provincial Governments, should go out first, and that the rest of the delegates and visitors follow. If you will kindly comply with the request of the moving-picture people, it will, I am sure, be appreciated.

The Conference adjourned at 12.30.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Conference resumed at 2.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, as I mentioned before the adjournment, we will now hear from a gentleman who acted as Secretary of the United States War Labour Board, a body appointed by the United States Government to act in co-operation with employers and employees for the purpose of maintaining industrial peace during the war period, and which had a very wide and varied experience in connection with the questions which will come before this body for consideration.

I have very much pleasure in calling on Mr. W. Jett Lauck, late Secretary of the United States War Labour Board, to speak

to us on the problems which existed and which still exist in the United States.

ADDRESS OF Mr. W. JETT LAUCK.

Mr. W. JETT LAUCK: Ladies and gentlemen: it is a great privilege to be here at this Conference. Intense interest is being manifested in the United States in these proceedings and in the outcome of your work. President Wilson, as you know, has called a similar conference for the first week in October. We are expecting to profit greatly from the work which you have already done in arranging a program, and as well as from any conclusions which you may reach.

As to the principles and policies which are to be considered by your Conference, I am not acquainted sufficiently with local conditions to make any comment. Moreover, they are for the parties in interest, or employers and employees, to decide. If I can be of any practical service to the Conference, it will be in two ways: first, by giving you my impressions in a brief, analytical way, of the tendencies in thought and action in the United States at the present time relative to the industrial situation; and second, by telling you of our experience in the adjustment of industrial disputes during the war in connection with the organization and work of the National War Labour Board, and the suggestions which that experience offers for a peace-time program.

INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS AND RELATIONS ANALOGOUS.

Industrial conditions and relations in Canada and in the United States are practically analogous. The parties in interest are often identical.

The really fundamental problem is also the same here in Canada as in the United States. Moreover, it is the same in the United States as it is abroad. As a matter of fact, it may be said to be widespread and ubiquitous. The problem is to lay sure foundations for industrial peace or the stability of production. This involves, it is generally conceded, the extension of democracy to industry, or, in other words, the foundation of a new industrial code or constitution, as a basis of procedure in adjusting future industrial relations.

INDUSTRIAL PEACE MUST FOLLOW THE CESSATION OF MILITARY CONFLICT

A military peace has been signed in Paris. Hostilities have terminated. A treaty has been drawn which has as one of its principal features a plan for bringing nations and peoples into closer knowledge and relations. By common counsel and well-considered action, it is hoped to prevent altogether or to minimize the possibility of future wars.

It is of equal importance now to prevent industrial warfare—to work out such a basis of understanding and procedure as to bring the conflicting interests in industrial life to an agreement which will make impossible the losses of industrial conflict. If the aspirations of industrial workers for a greater measure of economic well-being are to be realized, or, if the desire for a greater participation in the control of industrial relations is to have a practical application, the essential condition is an industrial treaty of peace, so to speak, an agreement as to underlying principles and as to the administrative machinery for interpreting and applying these principles, so that industrial operations may be resumed with the certainty not only that production will not be interrupted, but that it will be stabilized and accelerated.

UNDERSTANDING AND CO-OPERATION IS THE UNDERLYING NECESSITY.

The necessary preliminary to all other considerations obviously is the development of a spirit of understanding and co-operation. Labour, through the centuries has come to look upon itself as an exploited class. Capital, on the other hand, at least in the United States even when inclined to be sympathetic, has tended often to look upon the aims and leadership of labour with distrust, because of the fear of an arbitrary use of power, or misguided restriction upon output or costs of production. The war has lessened this feeling on both sides to a remarkable extent. Our experience on the National War Labour Board almost invariably was that alleged grievances and troubles on both sides oftentimes practically disappeared by the mere bringing of the contending parties together for discussion. Employers have come more and more to the realization that the administration of industry is to a greater or less degree a public duty, and that industrial workers have certain fundamental rights and privileges. The employees, on the other hand, also have had it impressed upon them that the attainment of their aspirations as to economic rights and economic well-being is conditioned upon the proper maintenance and acceleration of production. Both sides have undoubtedly come to a greater measure of understanding that the well-being of all depends upon co-operation along

the lines of certain principles and standards of all those engaged in industry.

THE POST-WAR SITUATION IS HOPEFUL.

The situation in the United States which has come from the war, therefore, is full of hope.

First, following immediately on the signing of the armistice, there was widespread agitation of an extremely radical or even revolutionary character. This was largely made possible (1) by the existence of grievances which had arisen during the war, but which it was claimed had never been satisfactorily adjusted, and (2) by the unemployment or sudden curtailment of work or earnings of large numbers of workmen, which had been brought about from the abrupt termination of war contracts and the simultaneous demobilization of our army and navy. Conditions, however, have gradually improved. There has been an opportunity for more careful thinking and leadership and for the study and analysis of experiments along extreme lines both at home and abroad. As a result, sounder counsels have prevailed. The extreme radical as well as the revolutionary agitator has been supplanted by the more conservative leaders. The attitude of our industrial workers may now be said to be that political democracy is a failure unless it is supplemented by measures for industrial democracy; but this, it is now realized, can be done without any revolutionary action or the overturning of existing institutions. The movement is being made to bring our industrial institutions and relations, by legislative processes and agreement, into conformity with our political institutions and democratic ideals. Education and agitation are now proceeding along these lines.

THE EXTENSION OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.

Second, the stimulus to collective bargaining which was given by the war has been very strongly operative since the armistice. Collective bargaining, so to speak, has been the vogue in industry. A considerable proportion of employers, it is true, who are still distrustful of unionism, have attempted to meet the situation with committee systems or through restricting recognition to organizations and committees of their own employees. The attitude of the more far-sighted employers, however, seems to be that they are willing to concede unionism, provided that they can be protected by an agreement which will maintain production. To the disinterested public, the tendency towards unionization of industry appears, as a rule, very pronounced and ultimately inevitable, and for this reason it is repeatedly urged that it should be accomplished at once, so as to prevent unnecessary industrial conflict and dislocations from which the public will suffer. The only real danger in this connection is that some of our large employers, who are still evidently doing their thinking on a pre-war basis, may provoke a general strike, produce chaos in industry and throw the labor movement into the hands of the extreme radicals, by denying to their employees the right of collective bargaining. This is the real significance of the situation in the steel industry in the United States at the present time.

WIDESPREAD INTEREST AND ACTIVITY.

Third, it may be said in general that the most encouraging sign in the United States is the widespread interest among all classes in industrial problems and the general conviction that proper remedies lie in ascertaining the facts, in education, and in cooperative effort, not only between labor and capital, but as between the public and labor and capital. Associations of employers have by federation established industrial research bureaus and have employed experts to collect facts and analyze constructive programmes. Labor organizations have adopted similar measures. A labor party has also been organized to advocate what might be termed the larger aspects of the labor problem. Civic associations representing the public have formed commissions to study conditions and policies at home and abroad. Whenever disputes arise between capital and labor in the future, it may be expected that the relative merits will be critically examined by the public in the full light of a well-developed understanding.

THE CHANGED ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH.

Finally, probably the most hopeful sign in the United States, strange as it may seem, is to be found in the changed attitude of the church. All leading ecclesiastical denominations, without exception, have cast aside their pre-war apathy and indifference towards the industrial world and have officially proclaimed their intense interest in industrial conditions. These pronouncements of the churches have not been limited to generalities, but elaborate and detailed constructive programmes have been

put forward for the purpose of affording a practical application of the conceptions of the churches; working funds have been collected, and clergymen, priests and laity have been urged to work for the realization of these constructive principles. The attitude has been boldly taken that industrial relations and conditions must be brought into complete harmony with the fundamental teachings of Christianity.

A force which was almost entirely unknown before the war has, therefore, been injected into the discussion of labor and industrial problems. Its significance cannot be overstimated. It is one of the miracles of the war. The churches may be said to have added an ethical and spiritual force to the movement for a more sound and liberal, democratic, industrial order, and it is the verdict of history that the moral and spiritual elements are those which in any movement make for permanent progress and human betterment.

As to experience of the National War Labor Board and the constructive suggestions which it offers for a Peace-time Program, I may say that our National War Labor Board originated in a National Industrial Conference similar to the present meeting, although much more restricted in the number of members. After the United States had been in the war a number of months, two vital needs became evident:

1 The necessity for uniformity in action among the procurement departments of the Government in fixing wages and hours, in war production, and,

2 The need for an industrial policy on the part of the Government, or an agreement as to principles regulating industrial relations and conditions betweeen employers and employees, which the Government could sanction, and which would not only guarantee war work against strikes and other causes of stoppage, but would also, while fully protecting employees in their fundamental rights, actually result in an acceleration of war production.

To meet this need, the President, through the Secretary of Labor, summoned a conference of employers and employees for the purpose of reaching an agreement as to principles and methods of procedure. The conference was constituted of five representatives selected by the National Industrial Conference Board, a federation of associations of employers, and five representatives of the American Federation of Labor. The organization was known as the War Labor Conference Board and was presided over alternately by joint chairmen, representing the public, nominated by each group. The employers' group selected ex-President William H. Taft, and the labor group Hon. Frank P. Walsh, of Kansas City.

PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURE ADOPTED.

As the result of the deliberations of this body, a series of fundamental principles were adopted as a basis for the settlement of industrial disputes, and were officially proclaimed by President Wilson, as the Government policy, on April 8, 1918.

At the same time that these principles were proclaimed, the National War Labor Board was established in the same form as the War Labor Conference Board had been organized. As a matter of fact, the War Labor Conference Board—the original industrial constitutional convention, so to speak—was reconstituted as the National War Labor Board. Its duty and functions were to interpret the fundamental principles agreed upon and to apply them in the settlement of industrial disputes. By force of circumstances, as a matter of fact, it became the supreme court of industry, in the United States, during the war.

SCOPE OF THE BOARD'S WORK AND ITS PROCEDURE.

It was originally intended that the board should pass only upon principles, or, to use a legal phrase, upon questions of pure law. It was planned that each procurement department of the Government should, by boards already instituted, or, by the creation of boards similar to the War Labor Board, pass upon questions of fact relative to wages, hours and working conditions. It was further planned that the procurement departments of the Government should, by agreement with boards constituted equally of employers and employees, from the basic industries, establish a uniform and standardized policy as to hours of work and rates of pay. The National War Labor Board would, under these conditions, therefore, have been a board of ultimate appeal in cases where it was claimed that there had been an infraction of its fundamental principles. No questions as to facts were to be subject to appeal to the National War Labor Board.

These plans were never fully carried out before the close of the war. Because of the failure to create lower boards in some procurement departments of the Government and in certain industries, the National War Labour Board had to take primary jurisdiction in a great many cases, and in addition to the interpretation and application of fundamental principles, pass upon questions of fact involving wages, hours and working conditions.

During the period of its existence of about one year, the board received and passed upon 1,245 controversies.

The board adopted the policy of appointing administrators to interpret and to assist in the application of its awards. A definite outline or plan for collective bargaining was also agreed upon, the underlying principles of which were accepted by all the procurement departments of the Government.

CONSTRUCTIVE POLICY SUGGESTED BY THE EXPERIENCE OF THE BOARD.

Under its method of organization and procedure the work of the board was so successful that it seemed to offer the best method not only of adjusting disputes during the war but of realizing to a large extent the democratization of industry, after the war. These results at the present time, it seems to me, could be obtained by the adoption of the following program based upon war time experience.

First, an agreement to and sanction of the fundamental principles which are to govern industrial relations and conditions by a national conference or congress, such as the present one, of employers and employees, or in other words, the mutual agreement as to a constitution or individual code.

Second, the creation of a National Labour Board, constituted as the National War Labour Board was, by agreement between employers and trade unions, to interpret and apply principles or constitution, and to act as a court of last resort in controversies involving principles or policies, but not to hear appeals as to matters of fact, involving wages or working conditions, or to have primary jurisdiction in such cases.

Third, the further establishment, by mutual agreement between employers and trade unions, of similar boards in the basic industries, consisting of national, district and local industrial boards. These boards would have complete and final jurisdiction as to wages or other working conditions and discipline, appeals being allowed from local and district to the National Industrial Board in each industry. Appeals could only be taken to the National Labour Board on the basis of violation of principles, or, in other words, of the industrial code. These industrial boards would practically be the same as the Whitley Joint Industrial Councils in Great Britain of which Col. Carnegie has spoken.

Fourth, the establishment in each industry, also by mutual agreement of trade unions and employers, of Joint Boards on Production. These would consist of shop, department or industry boards. Their functions would be, by joint action, to formulate and agree upon proper methods of increasing production and decreasing labour costs. Full access would be given to all labour, cost and production records, and a cost accountant would be employed by each board, the principle to be established that the wage-earners would participate proportionately with management in the results of this co-operative activity to decrease costs and accelerate production.

CO-OPERATION AND INCREASING OUTPUT.

By the establishment of Boards on Production constituted equally of employers and employees in individual establishments, genuine co-operation in increasing output may be attained. The employee will have a direct interest in lowering costs, for it will mean an increase in his regular earnings for any given pay period, while, on the other hand, by his representative on the Board of Production, he will be protected against any excessive speeding-up, or any measures for accelerating production which are opposed to the permanent welfare. The employer, on the other hand, will have the assurance that a constant effort is being made to reduce costs and will be freed from his former fear of arbitrary and misguided restrictions on output. Profit sharing, as it has been advocated, has usually been unsatisfactory to employers, because returns are indeterminate and long deferred, and because the amount of profits in which the worker may participate is affected by forces over which the workers have no control, such as managerial ability, the policy of the corporation and other factors. This plan would really constitute co-operation and in times costs democratically at the source, and would be free from all these objections.

JOINT CHAIRMEN OF NATIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL BOARDS.

The ideal arrangement in organizing the National Labour Board as well as the industrial boards would be to limit the membership to equal representation of capital and labour, and have representatives from each side alternate as chairman. This policy has been adopted in the United States Railway Administration, where labour has been organized for many years and where railway managers and representatives of the brotherhoods have become accustomed to dealing directly with each other. The same condition was true, as we recall, of the conciliation

boards which were so successful in Great Britain prior to the war. In the United States, however, labour has not been extensively organized. Many unions are young, and their leaders are more or less inexperienced. This condition of affairs will also be greatly accentuated by a rapid expansion of unionism in the future. Moreover, many employers have only recently entered into trade agreements and are without experience in negotiation. Under these conditions, representatives of either side on joint boards find it very difficult to assume a judicial attitude. The tendency has been and will be for some time, for each group to be advocates rather than judges. To meet this situation practically, the best suggestion which has been put forward has been the selection by each group of joint chairmen from the public. These joint chairmen, although in general sympathetic with their groups, are not distinct partisans. By their presence and their attitude, they lessen the tendency toward partisan discussion, require a complete setting forth of the facts, and make possible decisions in accord with agreed facts and principles. As a temporary or ad interim expedient, so to speak where it is necessary until trade unionists and employer members of the National Labour Board and the industrial boards have been, by contact and experience, able to attain to a more judicial attitude, joint chairmen may be selected by each side. In the course of time, these joint chairmen may be liminated.

THE PRACTICABILITY OF THE PROPOSAL.

What has been done during the war can certainly be done in times of peace. The requisite spirit of co-operation is alone necessary. The experience of the National War Labour Board has demonstrated that such a system of boards as I have outlined could be practically operated. Throughout the discussion as to these boards it will be noted I have assumed the recognition of labour organizations—not any particular union, but labour organizations, as such. This condition to my mind is necessary to a full measure of success.

Because of the experience with the National War Labour Board in the United States, this programme I believe, would safeguard industry from the autocratic influence of either capital or labour and make possible a large measure of industrial democracy. At the same time it would not only protect fully and add to the interests of capital and labour, but would also advance the well-being of the general public, for the reason that it would, by co-operative effort of capital and labour, increase the productive efficiency of industry as a whole.

Mr. E. G. HENDERSON: Before we proceed with the next part of the business, which, I understand, is the consideration of the report of the Committee who have made the regulations for this meeting, I am requested by a number of employer delegates to express the great regret that we feel that, owing to illness, Sir Robert Borden was prevented from attending this Convention, one of the greatest, if not the greatest which has ever been held in Canada, and the results of which may have such a far-reaching effect upon the industrial activities of this country. I do not know any employers here present who have not come determined to do anything they can to meet the claims advanced by those who are known as the employed; and if they differ it is not because they do not desire to give the highest wages to each employee or do not wish to see that he enjoys everything which makes life pleasant. They are in this position: not only are they trustees for those whose money is invested, and arbitrators as between them and the employees, but they have also to stand for that great class which was so ably described by the Hon. Makenzie King this morning—the public. If there should be any difference, as I stated before, it is not because they do not want to meet the wishes and requests of the employed.

I move, seconded by Mr. Tom Moore, that the members of this Conference desire to convey to Sir Robert Borden their regret that he has been unable to be here, and their thanks for the very exhaustive address which was read; also their thanks to the Hon. Mr. Sifton, Hon. Mr. Rowell, the Hon. Mackenzie King, Col. Carnegie and the last speaker.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Mr. Chairman and assembled Delegates, it is a pleasure to me, and yet a regret, to rise on this occasion to second the motion which has just been made. It is regrettable because it is necessary to second a motion referring to the illness of the right honourable the Prime Minister at this particular time. It is certainly a great regret, that must be felt and expressed by all, that on such a memorable occasion as this, after the arduous services that the Premier rendered in Paris on similar questions, he should be prevented by temporary illness from

attending in person a Conference of this nature. However, I suppose it is impossible to regulate the course of nature in that respect, and we must recognize, though he is absent in person, that through the message he has sent to us he is really present with us in spirit and in desire for the success of this Conference.

In regard to the expression of thanks to the Government for the calling of this Conference, I wish, on behalf of the delegates amongst whom I have the honour to sit on this side of the House, to say that we heartily concur in the expressions which have just been made by Mr. Henderson on behalf of the employers' representatives. We feel that a Conference of this kind is momentous not only to the workers concerned, but also to the entire industrial development of this country. We have heard inspiring addresses this morning from the gentlemen referred to in this resolution of thanks. We have heard from them the expression of ideals and in some instances the recital of actual conditions as they existed or do exist in Great Britain and the United States. We feel that this occasion, created by the Government, on which capital and labour and the rest of the community, through their representatives in the Dominion and Provincial Governments, are here assembled, is one that can perhaps be likened to the meeting of the Lion and the Lamb. I do not know—I suppose that each person will interpret in his own or her own mind as to who has been the lion during the past few years; but I desire to say that I hope the conclusions of this Conference will not be similar to the result in the fable of the Lion and the Lamb; they agreed mutually when the lion retired with the lamb inside of it. I hope that we shall retire as we have come—equal in intelligence, and equal in desire to do that which will be best for the country as a whole, irrespective of the group to which we may belong.

I would like also to say at this time that I feel that this Conference is called, not for the purpose of expressing eulogies, not for the purpose of becoming a mutual admiration society, but rather to try to render effective, to put into action, the ideals which have been expressed by many of the speakers this morning. For four years the workers of this country have been attempting to reach the position which I feel has been reached on this particular occasion—a position in which, on a national basis, or on a national scale, we may be able to discuss frankly, with our cards on the table, face upwards, all the problems which beset the worker in the following out of his occupation and in securing an opportunity for a full and good life.

These are the problems which we have to face in this Conference which we are now beginning, and, Mr. Chairman, I shall have no doubt of the ultimate result of the Conference if the employers meet us in a similar spirit, as I have found them in smaller groups prepared to do.

On the other hand, I feel this also, that, even though it may be possible for employer and employee to reach a common ground on many of the subjects, this Conference would be futile unless the Government in its turn were willing, not only to agree with what we have done, but also to incorporate into immediate legislation the decisions which we may consider to be for the benefit of the country as a whole. I would therefore respectfully suggest that perhaps some declaration might be made by the Government representatives, if it is possible at all, as to the probable action of the Government in this respect. It might serve as that very inspiration which was referred to this morning, for each side to devote their best energies, not with the thought that the discussions were only for propaganda, not with the thought that the discussions would be futile, but knowing the seriousness and the responsibility of that which they were doing, and knowing from the declaration by the Government that our judgments and decisions would be taken as the basis for action by the several governments that may be concerned in the matters which we are about to discuss.

I may perhaps be trespassing a little, Mr. Chairman. I think it was agreed that neither employers nor employees should on this occasion attempt to make a speech. Therefore, with the few words that I have said, I desire to associate, as far as I am able, those with whom I collaborate, in expressing appreciation of the Government's action in calling this Conference, regret at the absence of the Premier, and the hearty wish that his recovery may be speedy.

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen: You have heard the remarks of the mover and the seconder of the motion, which is, that the members of this Conference desire to express their regret that the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden is, through illness, prevented from attending this Conference, and that the Conference wishes to thank him for his high-minded and inspiring address, which was read this morning. The Conference also desire to thank the Hon.

Mr. Sifton, the Hon. Mr. Rowell, the Hon. Mackenzie King, Col. Carnegie, and Mr. W. Jett Lauck for their addresses. I have much pleasure in putting the motion on behalf of the mover and the seconder.

The motion was carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN: May I assume to speak on behalf of the Prime Minister and say to you that I know that Sir Robert Borden will deeply appreciate the expression of feeling that is embodied in the motion just passed. I know that Sir Robert Borden was intensely anxious to attend this Conference, for the reason that he desires that the outcome of this Conference and the results that will probably follow from it—if it measures up to our expectations—may be of very great benefit to the future progress and prosperity of this country and the happiness of its people.

I did not desire to interrupt Mr. Henderson as he rose to speak, but I have decided to ask one other gentleman to speak briefly to-day. He is not on the programme and we did not know until a day or two ago that he would be here; but I feel that it is fitting that we should hear from him, and I believe that you will all concur. Industry depends very largely upon transportation. There are in the United States approximately two million men and women engaged in the transportation industry, and there are, in round numbers, a couple of hundred thousand in Canada. The employees of the transportation systems are very highly organized, and they have for many years, in most cases, been dealing through their representatives with the employing railway companies. I think they have to a very large degree obtained and merited the confidence and respect of the railway managers with whom they have had to deal. Inasmuch as those organizations are all international in character, inasmuch as the executive heads, of the transportation departments at least, of the railway organizations, have been playing a very active and prominent part in industrial life and in directing the movements of organized labour during the past few years in the United States and Canada, and, inasmuch as they have been sufficiently interested in this Conference to come here voluntarily for the purpose of obtaining information, participating in the Conference and meeting the gentlemen addressing it, I feel that it is but fitting that we should have a few remarks from at least one of the leaders of the great organizations connected with transportation on the North American continent. I would therefore crave your indulgence for a short time, and I know that you will be well repaid for the time you spend in listening to Mr. Warren S. Stone, the President of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Cleveland, Ohio, who is the head of the oldest labour organization, I believe, in railroad circles. I must state on behalf of Mr. Stone that he had no notification that we would ask him to speak; therefore you will understand that he speaks to you wholly unprepared; but I am sure he will have a message that will be of interest to you.

Mr. WARREN S. STONE: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I appreciate very much the compliment of your Chairman in giving me an invitation to be present. I look upon this as one of the red-letter days in my life. I had no expectation that I would even be allowed to speak, let alone being called on to speak. It would perhaps be presumptuous on the part of a man from the States to come over and undertake to tell you how to run your affairs in Canada. Yet I am vitally interested in the questions that confront you, because of the fact that I am one of the executive officers of a labour organization that is international, and we have on the other side of the line the same problems that you have here. I think I know something of the social unrest that is slumbering down underneath the crust. I think I know how easily the embers could be fanned into flame at this period. The war has been won, and we of the labour unions have done everything we could to help win it. Many of our railroad men sleep in Flanders' fields to-day. They sacrificed their lives in an effort to help win the war and save the world for democracy. So we have been giving the best we had, both in men and in money, to help win the war. Now that the war has been won, I look upon the present as a far more critical time than even the war itself, because upon the solution of the problems facing us in the next few months will depend whether we are going to set the clock of time back forty or fifty years, or whether we shall be able to meet the new conditions in this new world that has come into existence. I believe that you can solve these problems. When I look into your faces I feel that if you cannot solve them I must despair of their solution elsewhere.

There is one common ground on which we meet—one question which confronts all of us, and which must be solved,

and solved quickly if we as nations are going to exist, and that is the question of the high cost of living. We all realize the spirit of unrest that exists, and that can be summed up in one short sentence; and why? Because the pay envelope on Saturday night does not buy the necessaries of life for the workingman and his family. We can talk in generalities all we please, but what is the solution? During the war we spent money; it was not a question of what it cost; it was a question of how quickly we could get it. We perhaps acquired extravagant habits; we perhaps got things out of the general line; and now we have to get back to a peace basis. It is the reconstruction period that concerns us now, and the great problem is going to be how to meet it. During the war we had profiteering, which was to be expected; but now there is no excuse for profiteering continuing, and some way must be found to stop it if we are going to exist.

I had the pleasure of going with the Advisory Board of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and talking to the President of the United States and appealing to him to do something. We had to have one of two things: either more wages or reduction in the cost of living. "Wages" is only a comparative term; wages simply means what you can buy with them. There is no use talking about a 20 per cent increase in wages if at the same time you have a 40 per cent increase in the cost of living. The increase in wages does not solve anything or settle anything, not permanently at all events. We have been going around in an endless cycle, the wages chasing the high cost of living, and never quite catching it. We must find some solution quickly; in that we are all vitally interested.

We are never going to solve the question of capital and labour until we sit down around a table and talk it out man-fashion. I am a firm believer in the face-to-face conference. I have found that while men may differ in their views they want to be fair and equitable; and I have often found that after all there was not so much difference between them, but a mutual interest. The solution of the question, I believe, is the human touch. So long as labour simply means a number on the pay-roll, not even a name; so long as an employer does not care what happens his labour so long as it produces so much; we shall never get anywhere. We must bring these people closer together

There is another thing which must not be lost sight of. Labour is always looked upon as producing, but it is one of the biggest consumers as well; and one of the problems that we have to deal with is to bring the consumer and the producer closer together. In the States, if we cannot do it in any other way, we are going to have a law passed that the price received by the producer must be stamped on the commodity, then we shall soon find out where the trouble is—whether it is the wholesaler, the jobber, or the retailer.

I want to express my pleasure in being here. I came here to learn, not to talk. I want to take away some new ideas.

The cry, "Am I my brother's keeper?" that has been ringing down through all the ages, has never before rung louder or clearer than it rings to-day.

In conclusion, there is just one thought that I want to leave with you. I hope that some time, some place—and I do not care from whom it comes, whether from the ranks of labour or from capital—some man will arise who will be big enough and broad enough to put back the word "brother" into the brotherhood of man.

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and Gentlemen, if I may trespass upon your patience for a few minutes, it might be proper for me at this time to refer briefly to the causes leading up to this Conference and to what the Government of Canada had in mind in inviting you here to-day.

During the war period there was a continually increasing spirit of co-operation between employer and employed, and between the Government and both, because of the mutual necessity, and because we all realized that if we were to succeed in the one thing for which we were contending, namely, the winning of the war, it must be by the practice of the spirit of co-operation. When the war happily ended new problems faced this country and all other countries which had participated in it; and, while not regarded as seriously as the war, yet in each country individually and to the citizens of each country the reconstruction problems are probably just as important or more so than was the war itself.

On November 11 last, when an Armistice was declared and hostilities ceased, there were, so far as Canada was concerned approximately half a million men and women who had to be demobilized and re-established in vocations other than those in which they were engaged during the war period.

Canada had, at the close of the war, approximately 330,000 soldiers still in service, all of whom had to be repatriated and re-established in civil life. At the same time, she had approximately 200,000 workers—men and women—engaged in war industries which almost entirely ceased upon the 11th of November, 1918. It was regarded as a prodigious task to re-establish all these people, and governments, both federal and provincial, and indeed municipal governments as well, individual employers, labour organizations, and individual workingmen, all realised the necessity of carrying on with the same spirit of co-operation that characterized their efforts during the war, until all those were re-established who had been displaced by reason of peace having come.

We might perhaps for a few moments consider what was done, how it was done, and what the results have been. Approximately 400,000 men, the flower of our Canadian manhood, were called away overseas to take part in the great war, and it became necessary to replace them to a very large extent in our factories and in other industrial activities by other men and very largely by women. In pre-war days the alien resident in Canada was very largely engaged in railway work and construction work of all kinds. Those activities to a very large extent ceased as the war progressed, and the men engaged therein found their way into the factories and other industries engaged in war-work, as well as into ordinary lines of industry. When the war ceased, it became necessary to re-establish in their former position and employment thousands upon thousands of men as they returned from overseas and, be it said to the credit of employers generally, the spirit of co-operation manifested in that connection in most instances was very fine indeed. I think it is true that during this period our army has been demobilized and the soldiers have been re-established in civil life, either in the positions which they occupied prior to enlistment, or in similar or better ones, to a greater extent than has been the case in almost any other country.

I heard the Minister of Militia say a few days ago—I think I quote him correctly—some 390,000 men had been demobilized and discharged from military service, and that those men had very largely already settled down and become re-established in civil life. This has worked no particular hardship upon anyone because of the fact that during the past few years the normal tide of immigration into Canada has almost entirely ceased, and that this year the labour that has been displaced by the return of our army is being absorbed instead of the usual tide of immigration that comes to Canada seeking employment. I feel very optimistic as to the future, and am confident that if nothing unforeseen arises it will be but a short time before we shall be looking to immigration to this country to meet our labour requirements. The policy of the Immigration Departments, both here and in the United States, as you are probably aware, has been to restrict immigration until it is needed.

The Government sought to co-operate with employers and with labour, particularly with organized labour, because it is almost impossible to co-operate with men who are not organized and who cannot be addressed or approached through established representatives, and the employers and the representatives of labour were brought together from time to time in a way to which they had not been accustomed. By reason of that contact they began to know each other better, and to find that they had many things in common; and last October representatives of the employers' interests and representatives of the labour interests met together and were able to agree upon a number of important matters, and to make joint representations to the Government concerning them, some of which have since been crystallized into law. That experiment, if I may so call it, made the Government feel that there were greater possibilities along the same line. As time went on and the winter advanced, it seemed more and more important that this spirit of confidence and co-operation should be encouraged and developed; and, with a view of taking no action unless it seemed to have the common consent and approval of the people concerned, the Government established a Commission which was sent through the country to meet employers and workmen and the public, and to hear evidence and opinions upon the great question of how best to solve the problem of capital and labour. That Commission was composed of seven men, two of whom represented the employers and were chosen by them through their organizations; two representing the labour interests; and two representing the public. In order that equilibrium might be maintained between employers and employees the two representatives of the public were chosen, one from the House of Commons and one from the Senate. The gentleman from the House of Commons was a member of one of the labour organizations, and the

gentleman from the Senate was an employer of labour. The Commission went out I believe fully determined to make an exhaustive inquiry; and they have made a very complete report, to which the Prime Minister referred in his message of this morning.

Among the recommendations included in the Report was one that a conference of this sort should be called to discuss the Report, and that there should be representatives of the two interests already named, and a third group made up of gentlemen representing the various interests particularly concerned in industry throughout the country. It was thought that if they endorsed the recommendations of the Commission, the Government might then well feel that it was warranted in accepting the recommendation of the Conference as the consensus of opinion of the people concerned, and in passing such legislation, either federal or provincial, as was proper.

That is a brief review of the causes leading up to the holding of this Conference. I hope that during the deliberations of the next few days every delegate will feel free to express his convictions frankly and honestly, and with proper courtesy and dignity towards all, and that as a result of this meeting here together recommendations may be made which will enable the federal and perhaps the provincial Governments—as some of the subjects you will have under consideration may fall within their jurisdiction—to act intelligently and with a fair idea of the will of those directly concerned.

It is not my intention further to delay the Convention. I will only say that I should like to emphasize the Prime Minister's recommendation as to the three principles referred to in his message this morning, namely, justice, confidence, and co-operation. In war our people made untold efforts and sacrifices to defend humanity against the autocracy of the Prussian; so, by open-handed justice, inspired confidence, and co-operation, may we promote industrial harmony and prosperity, thereby promoting human happiness in both the present and future generations.

There will now be distributed to each delegate the report of a Committee that was appointed to advise in respect of arrangements for this Conference and in reference to detailed procedure. That Committee was selected some time ago, and met on Thursday last. It was composed of six gentlemen representing the interests involved, and they have made a report for this Conference for the purpose of saving time and discussion. The Secretary of the Conference will kindly read each item, and with the consent of the Conference we might adopt the plan of considering and adopting each item as we proceed, as this will enable us to make better progress in the matter.

The SECRETARY: This is the report of a Committee appointed to advise in respect of arrangements for the Conference; it is signed by Mr. Magrath as Chairman, and by myself as Secretary: Those members of the Joint Committee, namely: Messrs. F. P. Jones, of the Canada Cement Company, Limited, Montreal, P. Q.; C. H. Carlisle, of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company of Canada, Limited, Toronto; E. G. Henderson, of the Canadian Salt Company, Limited, Windsor, Ontario, were appointed on the recommendation of the Canadian Manufacturers Association; and those members, namely: Messrs. R. A. Rigg, Organizer of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, Winnipeg, Manitoba; Gus. Francq, of the International Typographical Union, Montreal, P. Q.; and W. R. Rolls, of the Brewer and Whisk Makers' Union, Hamilton, Ontario, were appointed on the recommendation of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada. The Chairman, Mr. C. A. Magrath, was chosen by the Minister of Labour, who also attended during a portion of the sessions of the Committee. The report is as follows:

Report of Committee appointed to advise in respect of arrangements for the National Industrial Conference, Canada, September, 1919.

The undersigned on behalf of the (a) Joint Committee appointed to advise in respect of arrangements for the National Industrial Conference beg leave to report that consideration has been given by the Committee to various matters connected with the hours of sessions, seating, the appointment of Committees and procedure in general.

It was explained that arrangements had already been made for the use of the Senate Chamber and of committee rooms, chief among, etc., suggested therewith for the purposes of the Conference and that the Conference would open on Monday, September 15th, at ten o'clock a.m. and continue on the following days, but not beyond Saturday the 20th instant.

With respect to further arrangements the Joint Committee recommend as follows:—That the sessions of the Conference shall begin at 10 a.m. and continue to 12.30 p.m. and from 2.30 to 5.30 p.m.

That the representatives of Employers and Employees shall be seated together rather than in separate groups; that the representatives of the Provincial Governments shall be provided with seats at the table in the centre of the Chamber and that those composing the Third Group shall be seated separately from the Employers' and Employees' delegates on either side

of the Chairman at the south end of the Chamber.

That admission to the floor of the Senate Chamber beyond the brass railing shall be by ticket only, and that lists shall be kept of those in attendance at the sessions of the Conference from day to day; further, that the Secretary be authorized to issue tickets for alternate delegates as may be necessary.

That on ten delegates standing a vote shall be taken by ballot on any resolution presented, also that voting shall be confined to the duly accredited representatives of the Employers and Employees respectively; further, that the vote of the Employers' and Employees' groups of delegates shall be taken separately.

That consideration of Item 1 of the proposed agenda shall be deferred until after consideration of Item 8 and that the numbering of the agenda shall be revised accordingly.

That Committees shall be appointed by the Conference on the following subjects, namely:—

(1) On Item 1 of the revised agenda, relating to industrial disputes legislation and to other labour laws;

(2) On Item 2 of the revised agenda, relating to hours of labour;

(3) On Item 3 of the revised agenda, relating to minimum wages legislation;

(4) On Item 4 of the revised agenda, relating to employees' right to organize, the recognition of labour unions and employees' right to collective bargaining;

(5) On Item 5 of the revised agenda, relating to the proposed establishment of joint industrial councils;

(6) On the subjects of state insurance against unemployment, sickness, invalidity and old age, etc.;

(7) On the subject of proportional representation;

(8) On other features of the report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, and any other proposals which may be introduced at the Conference bearing on the relations of employers and employees.

That each of the foregoing eight Committees shall be composed of three representatives of the Employers' group at the Conference, selected by the latter, and three representatives of the Employees' group, selected by the employees; that each Committee shall be authorized to appoint one of its own members as Chairman, who shall have the same right of voting as the other members, but shall not have any casting vote; that no Committee shall draft any resolutions until after the subject has been discussed in the Conference; and further, that no resolution shall be disposed of by the Conference without reference to Committee, unless by the unanimous consent of the employers' and employees' groups.

That after the conclusion of the addresses already arranged for on the opening day by the Right Honourable Sir R. L. Borden, the Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Colonel D. Carnegie of London, England, and Mr. W. Jett Lauck of Washington, D.C., in respect of each item on the agenda, the employers' and employees' groups shall each be entitled to select a speaker to lead in the presentation of their views and that these speakers shall be entitled to speak for thirty minutes in opening the discussion and for not more than five minutes by way of reply; that the subject shall thereafter be open to general discussion by any of the delegates of the various groups, and that subsequent speeches on each item of the agenda shall be limited to not more than ten minutes.

Signed on behalf of the members of the Joint Committee.

Gerald H. Brown, Secretary. C. A. Magrath, Chairman.

September 12, 1919.

The various clauses of the above report were agreed to until that relating to the appointment of Committees was reached.

Mr. R. A. RIGG: In connection with this paragraph of the Report, I rise for the purpose of submitting an amendment on behalf of the Labour Group of this Conference. I was a member of the Committee appointed for the purpose of making preliminary arrangements for this Conference, and agreed to the provision of the agenda as it has been read just now by the Secretary. The Labour Group, in meeting and discussing the proposals of the Committee, came to the conclusion—and I have revised my own opinion in respect to the matter, so that I am in perfect agreement with the decision—that our action with regard to the matter of Committees was not just everything that might have been desired, or that would be in the best interests of all concerned; and I rise for the purpose of moving the following amendment to the Report:

That the report be amended by the appointment of another Committee to deal with the subject-matter of Item No. 7 of the printed proposed agenda.

That is, the agenda as it appears in printed pamphlet form, and with which I presume every member of the Conference has been supplied. That Item No. 7 reads as follows:

7. Consideration of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations that the findings of the Commission be put into effect in all work controlled by the Government where the principles of democratic management can be applied.

The findings of the Royal Commission on this matter can be found on page 19 of the Report of the Commission as follows:

(f) That the findings of the Commission be put into effect in all work controlled by the Government where the principles of democratic management can be applied.

It is perfectly true that Committee No. 8 in the Report that has just been read by the Secretary is an omnibus committee, and competent to deal with almost any conceivable subject that might properly come before this Conference.

But this particular subject, emphasized in the original agenda by being made the

subject-matter of a separate item, has been judged to be so important by the Labour Group—and I doubt very much whether the importance of it would be questioned by any member of the Conference—that this amendment that I have to submit is proposed for the purpose of recognizing the importance of this subject and providing guaranteed ample facilities for the discussion of it and for arriving at a decision thereon. The amendment that I beg to submit, Mr. Chairman, is as follows:

That the report be amended by the appointment of another committee to deal with the subject-matter of Item No. 7 of the printed proposed agenda, and that the report be further amended by making this subject Item No. 8, in the clause of the report, "Appointment of Committees", and that the present Item No. 8 become No. 9.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the amendment as proposed by Mr. Rigg. Is there any discussion?

Mr. TOM MOORE: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is no seconder yet. I was in hopes that there might be a seconder across the floor, but apparently he has not materialized. In rising to formally second the motion I would like to refer for just one moment to the importance of the subject. It has always been felt that the public authorities of this country should be model employers. It is not always possible to legislate for certain conditions, but it is many times possible by example to have others put into effect conditions which cannot be legislated for. It has also been said on many occasions that Civil Servants should not exercise the ordinary prerogative of the individual worker, because they are in the employ of the community as a whole. In making these declarations from time to time, the different public authorities undoubtedly recognized some difference between the position of civil servants, or of public employees, and the position of the ordinary industrial workers engaged by private citizens or by corporate companies. In the address by Col. Carnegie this morning we noticed reference to the fact that the British Government had established councils for civil servants, and that other classes of public authorities—municipal authorities, etc.—had followed suit. We noticed also that in the invitations which were extended the Government itself again recognized the distinction by asking the Civil Service Federation, or the public service employees, to send separate representatives to this Conference. Therefore I feel that it is in the interest of all that, this distinction being recognized in so many ways, it should be further recognized by the appointment of a Committee to deal specifically with the applicability of the many subjects that we may discuss to the public employees of this country. I would therefore second the motion.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any other delegate present who desires to speak on the motion?

Mr. MELVILLE WHITE: I would suggest that this motion be referred back to the Agenda Committee, which, I understand, is still in existence. The agenda as it appears finally to-day is the result of the deliberations of that Committee, and I think perhaps the most proper way of taking care of this amendment is to refer it back to those gentlemen who made up the agenda, and have them report to-morrow morning as to the conclusion which they have arrived at.

Mr. R. A. RIGG: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, the only serious objection that could be made is that we are now dealing with this report, and that we are about to determine the mind of the Convention with regard to the relative positions of these various clauses in our agenda, and if we do consider this matter to-morrow morning, we shall then have to annul the work that we may do now, provided that the resolution which I have submitted receives the endorsation of the Conference. That is the reason why I have taken the action of pressing the matter at the present moment.

Mr. MELVILLE WHITE: I would suggest that we have had no time to consider the amendment in any way at all. I do not understand why it was not brought up before the Agenda Committee in some way which would have produced a decision in the matter. So I still think it ought to be referred back to that Committee for further discussion.

Mr. W. A. MACDONALD: The previous speaker may not understand this matter. It is simply a proposal to give the Civil Servants the same right that other organizations have had—the right to investigation before a Conciliation Board, or in such matters as that. It would only give them the right to put their case before a board, just the same as outside organizations may do. I do not see that there is anything to be referred back. I think any sensible man would recognize the fact that a body of men working in the Civil Service should

have the same opportunity as the rest of the people.

Dr. D. STRACHAN: I beg leave to second Mr. White's motion, that this be referred to the Standing Committee on the Agenda. You can very well understand, I am not discussing the merits of the question at all, but I rather think that we, sitting in this building with its historic traditions, ought to conform as far as possible to parliamentary procedure. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the proper thing to do—and you will put me right, Sir, if I am not correct—is simply to refer back this new matter to the committee and have them bring in a report. I am perfectly sure that the proposed committee will be appointed.

The CHAIRMAN: There is now before the Convention a motion to amend the committee's report. There is also an amendment to that amendment, which is, I understand, that the motion proposed by Mr. Rigg, seconded by Mr. Moore, should be referred to the Agenda Committee for its recommendation. The question is upon the adoption of the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. R. A. RIGG: Mr. Chairman, I do not see that there is any particular harm being done by the reference of this matter to the Special Committee, and, if my comrades are in agreement with me—

Some DELEGATES: We will agree.

Mr. R. A. RIGG: I agree to the amendment that has been proposed.

The CHAIRMAN: Therefore the proposed amendment to the amendment becomes the amendment to the original motion. It is, that the amendment proposed by Mr. Rigg be referred to the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The final clause of the report of the Agenda Committee was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall we adopt the report of the committee as a whole, subject to the one matter being referred to the committee?

The report as a whole was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Probably the next proper step for the Conference to take would be to select members to act on the various committees as outlined in the proposal we have just adopted. The plan proposed by the Arrangements Committee was that the employers' representatives should select three names of persons to serve on each of the committees referred to, and that the labour representatives should do likewise. If the respective interests have the names of those who they propose should serve on these various committees and could present them now, then the committees could proceed to organize and be ready to receive any resolutions that are referred to them, or bring in resolutions as they might be called upon to do in the performance of the duties outlined in the recommendations you have just adopted. Is there any gentleman present prepared to submit the names on behalf of the employers' group?

Mr. J. E. WALSH: The names have already been handed in to the Secretary, Mr. Chairman.

The SECRETARY: I have not received them yet.

Mr. J. E. WALSH: We will give them to you in a moment.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any one present prepared to submit the list of names of those who it is proposed should serve on these committees on behalf of the employees?

Mr. TOM MOORE: Yes.

Mr. J. E. WALSH: We may have to make one or two slight changes in ours.

The CHAIRMAN: The Secretary will now read the list of names of persons proposed by the employers to serve on the various committees.

Mr. JAMES H. ASHDOWN: I think that the employers as a body have not been consulted. I myself had no notice of the meeting. The whole matter appears to have been referred to the manufacturers. Under these circumstances I think it would be better to have an adjournment now and let each division decide on their representatives and come here to-morrow morning prepared to take up the question.

Mr. TOM MOORE: The labour group raise no objection to the suggestion made relative to the question of adjournment in order to facilitate matters. Our list is ready, and we can submit it the first thing in the morning.

Mr. JAMES H. ASHDOWN: In accordance with what I have suggested, I now move that we adjourn to meet to-morrow morning.

Col. J. A. LITTLE: I have much pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in seconding Mr.

Ashdown's motion that we adjourn to get our nominations ready and to present the list in the morning.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion that we do now adjourn until 10 o'clock to-morrow morning and that meanwhile nominations regarding the personnel of the proposed committees be prepared and submitted to the Conference the first thing to-morrow.

The Convention adjourned until to-morrow at 10 a.m.

CANADA

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

of Dominion and Provincial Governments with Representative Employers and Labour Men at Ottawa, September, 1919.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

SECOND DAY.

CONTENTS.

Committee of Arrangements—first and second reports.

Resolutions Committees appointed.

Labour Laws—Desirability of Unification and Co-ordination.

Addresses by John Bruce, J. R. Shaw, Tom Moore, A. Monro Grier, James Simpson.

Hours of Labour—Discussion:

Addresses by J. A. McClelland, J. R. Shaw, R. A. Rigg, M. P. White, J. H. Ashdown, Col. Carnegie, Miss Helena Gutteridge, Hon. E. J. Davis, Hon. G. D. Robertson, John A. Flett, G. M. McGregor, E. S. Woodward, E. M. Trowern, W. R. Trotter, E. G. Henderson, Hon. C. A. Dunning, Robert Baxter, James Winning.

The Senate Chamber,

Ottawa, Tuesday, September 16, 1919.

MORNING SESSION

The Conference met at 10 a. m., Hon. Senator Gideon D. Robertson, Minister of Labour, presiding.

Mr. Gerald H. Brown acted as Secretary.

In addition to those in attendance on the first day of the Conference, whose names were given in the report of the proceedings of yesterday, there were present to-day the following:

Representing the Government of Nova Scotia: Hon. George H. Murray, Premier; Hon. R. M. MacGregor and Hon. E. E. Finn, Members of the Executive Council without Portfolio.

Representing the Government of Alberta: Hon. C. R. Mitchell, Provincial Treasurer.

Frank McKenna, of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, Vancouver, B. C., was present to-day also C. G. MacNeill, O. B. E. Whitesides, Coleman present to-day.

Jas. T. Mosley, representing Moving Pictures Industry present to-day.

Substitute delegates attended to-day as follows:

Thomas L. Crossley, Chemical Engineer, Toronto, Ont., for Alfred Burton, Toronto, of the Third Group.

R. L. McIntyre, of McGregor & McIntyre, Toronto, Ont., for C. H. Carlisle, Toronto, for the Employers.

D. Kyle, of the Algoma Steel Corporation, Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., for N. C. Sinclair, St. Thomas, Ont., for the Employers.

P. R. Wilson, of the Spanish River Pulp and Paper Mills, for F. A. Sabbaton, of Grand'Mère, Que., for the Employers.

The following gentlemen attended the Conference to-day as visitors:

H. B. Butler, C. B., Assistant Secretary, British Ministry of Labour and Provisional Secretary to the International Labour Conference at Washington, D.C.

L. Magnusson, of the United States Department of Labour, Washington, D. C.

Ernest T. Trigg, President, National Federation of Construction Industries of the United States, and Director of Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

John C. Frazee, Executive Secretary, National Federation of Construction Industries of the United States.

COMMITTEE OF ARRANGEMENTS.

FIRST AND SECOND REPORTS.

The CHAIRMAN: The first item of interest this morning will be to receive a report from the Committee on Arrangements in connection with the matters that where assigned to it yesterday afternoon.

Mr. C. A. MAGRATH: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I have two reports to present. I will read the second report of the Committee. You received the first report yesterday.

Second Report of Joint Committee appointed to advise in respect of arrangements for the National Industrial Conference, Canada, September, 1919.

The undersigned, on behalf of the Joint Committee appointed to advise in respect of arrangements for the National Industrial Conference, beg leave to report that, in accordance with the direction of the Conference consideration was given to the proposal of Mr. R. A. Rigg, seconded by Mr. Tom Moore, in favour of the establishment of a committee on Item Six of the revised agenda relating to the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, that the findings of the Commission should be put into effect in all work controlled by the Government where the principle of democratic management can be applied, and that the previous report of the Committee on Arrangements be amended by the inclusion of a provision for this committee as number eight in the committee list, number eight in the previous list to become number nine.

The proposal in question was unanimously concurred in by the Committee on Arrangements and is recommended accordingly for acceptance by the Conference.

(Sgd.) C. A. Magrath,
Chairman.

(Sgd.) Gerald H. Brown,
Secretary.

I beg to move, Sir, that the agenda be amended accordingly.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. C. A. MAGRATH (reading):

Third Report of Joint Committee appointed to advise in respect of arrangements for the National Industrial Conference, Canada, September, 1919.

The undersigned, on behalf of the Joint Committee appointed to advise in respect of arrangements for the National Industrial Conference, beg leave to report that a meeting was held last evening with representatives of the Third Group at the Conference, at which consideration was given to the desire of the Third Group for representation on the various committees of the Conference. It was stated that the members of this group realize that on account of the basis of organization adopted, it would be difficult to grant them voting power; but it was represented that the members of the Third Group could render useful service on the committees by way of information and counsel without the vote.

This proposal met with the unanimous acceptance of the Committee on Arrangements. It was further agreed to advise that the Third Group should be invited to select two representatives to be appointed on its behalf to each of the proposed nine committees of the Conference. Under these circumstances the Committee on Arrangements recommend that its previous report on this point be amended accordingly.

(Sgd.) C. A. Magrath,
Chairman.

(Sgd.) Gerald H. Brown,
Secretary.

I therefore beg to move, Sir, that the agenda be amended accordingly.

Mr. A. D. WEEKS: I have pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in seconding that motion. It is only a reasonable request. We are here for the purpose of establishing a common ground upon which to base our future industrial structure, and I think the Committee should have the benefit of the views of members of the Third Group.

The CHAIRMAN: The effect of the motion would be that the Committee, instead of consisting of six members, as was proposed yesterday, will consist of eight, and the members in the so-called Third

Group will have representation on each Committee, in order that they may have a voice and offer their suggestions to the Committee and co-operate with it.

The motion was agreed to.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEES APPOINTED.

TITLES AND COMPOSITION OF COMMITTEES DEALING WITH VARIOUS PROBLEMS.

The Conference proceeded to appoint the various Committees on Resolutions. The members of the Committees representing the Employers were nominated by Mr. M. P. White; the members representing the Employees were nominated by Mr. R. A. Rigg; the members representing the Third Group were nominated by Mr. Wills MacLachlan.

The Committees as nominated were appointed as follows:

1. Consideration of the desirability of unifying and co-ordinating the existing labour laws of the Dominion Parliament and the provincial legislatures, and the consideration of any new labour laws which are deemed necessary.

Employers:

John R. Shaw, Canada Furniture Manufacturers, Ltd., Woodstock, Ont.; A. Munro Grier, Canadian Electric Association, Toronto; Richard Thomson, Hawthorn Mills, Carleton Place, Ont.; (Spare) R. W. Wolvin, Halifax Shipyards, Ltd., Halifax, N.S.

Employees:

Joe Gorman, James Sommerville, J. Winning, F. McKenna, Alternate.

Third Group:

John Loe, Valleyfield, Que.; Fraser S. Keith, Montreal.

2. Consideration of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations respecting hours of labour.

Employers:

M. P. White, Canadian General Electric Co., Ltd., Toronto, Ont.; Fred Armstrong, Toronto, Builders Exchange, Toronto, Ont.; E. M. Trowern, Retail Merchants Association, Ottawa; (Spare) J. Fraser Gregory, Murray & Gregory, Ltd., St. John, N.B.

Employees:

J. A. McClelland, W. B. Hunter, Miss Doris Meakin, J. W. Frame, T. Jackson, alternates.

Third Group:

Calvin Lawrence, Ottawa, Ont.; Major R. P. Rogers, Cobalt, Ont.

3. Consideration of Minimum Wage Laws.

Employers:

J. B. Thompson, James Thompson & Sons, Ltd., Vancouver, B.C.; O. W. Waller, Swift Canadian Co., Ltd., Toronto, Ont.; F. G. Daniels, Dominion Textile Co., Ltd., Montreal; (Spare) W. T. Gregory, Imperial Tobacco Co., Leamington.

Employees:

E. W. A. O'Dell, Miss Helena Gutteridge, Fred Bush, A. Macdonald, alternate.

Third Group:

R. B. Maxwell, Ottawa, Ont.; Col. Thomas Cantley, New Glasgow, N.S.

4. Consideration of: (a) Employees' right to organize, (b) recognition of labour unions, (c) the right of employees to collective bargaining.

Employers:

J. P. Anglin, Montreal Building Association, Montreal, Que.; D. H. McDougall, Canadian Mining Institute, New Glasgow, N.S.; A. B. Weeks, Canadian Northwest Steel Co., Ltd., Vancouver, B.C.; (Spare) E. Parnell, Spiers-Parnell Baking Co., Winnipeg.

Employees:

W. L. Best, J. C. O'Connor, Adam C. Hay, T. Izzard, Wm. McKenzie, alternates.

Third Group:

F. R. Ewart, Toronto, Ont.; Ald. C. H. Grant, Edmonton, Alta.

5. Consideration of:

(a) The recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations in favour of the establishment of a bureau to promote the establishment and development of Joint Industrial Councils.

(b) The further recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations regarding the establishment of Joint Plant and Industrial Councils.

Employers:

F. P. Jones, the Canada Cement Co., Ltd., Montreal, Que.; Dr. D. Strachan, Imperial Oil Co., Ltd., Sarnia, Ont.; J. G. Gemmel, International Harvester Co. of Canada, Ltd., Hamilton. (Spare) F. A. Sabbaine, Laurentide Co., Ltd., Grand Mère, Que.

Employees:

Fred. Walsh, David Casey, O. Fleury, J. A. Flett, alternate.

Third Group:

Wills McLachlan, Col. David Carnegie.

6. State Insurance against unemployment, sickness, invalidity, and old age.

Employers:

J. S. McLean, Harris Abattoir Co., Ltd., Toronto, H. Bertram, John Bertram & Sons Co., Ltd., Dundas; F. H. Whitton, The Steel Co. of Canada, Ltd., Hamilton. (Spare) J. Burns, P. Burns & Co., Ltd., Calgary.

Employees:

Walter Rollo, Mrs. Kathleen Derry, R. C. McCutcheon, J. Barnet, J. E. Tighe, alternates.

Third Group:

G. Frank Beer, Toronto, Ont.; W. E. Segsworth, Ottawa, Ont.

7. Proportional Representation.

Employers:

P. L. Miller, Canadian Vickers Co., Ltd., Montreal; J. S. McKinnon and Co., Ltd., Toronto; J. H. Ashdown, The Ashdown Hardware Co. Ltd., Winnipeg. (Spare) E. C. Knight, B. C. Employers' Association, Vancouver.

Employees:

Gus. Francq, E. S. Woodward, J. Lockwood, J. Sexton, alternate.

Third Group:

Sir John Willison, Toronto, Ont.; Arthur Roberts, K.C., Bridgewater, N.S.

8. Consideration of the Recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations that the findings of the Commission be put into effect in all work controlled by the Government where the principle of democratic management can be applied.

Employers:

Hugh Blain, Eby, Blain, Ltd., Toronto; T. R. Deacon, Manitoba Bridge and Iron Works, Ltd., Winnipeg; Angus McLean, Bathurst Lumber Co., Ltd., Bathurst, N.B. (Spare) P. W. Ellis, P. W. Ellis Co. Ltd., Toronto.

Employees:

F. Grierson, J. A. Gillis, A. R. Mosher, W. G. Powlesland, Lou Braithwaite, alternates.

Third Group:

R. R. Grant, Toronto, Ont.; Major T. D. Bouchard, St. Hyacinthe, Que.

9. Other subjects which may arise.

Employers: Hon. E. J. Davis, Davis Leather Co., Ltd., Newmarket; E. G. Henderson, The Canadian Salt Co. Ltd., Windsor; W. J. Bulman, Bulman Bros, Ltd., Winnipeg. (Spare) J. R. Davies, Alberta Foundry & Machine Co. Ltd., Medicine Hat.

Employees: J. T. Foster, Jas. Marsh, George Smith, Major McInnes, J. A. Rousseau, alternates.

Third Group:

G. G. MacNeil, Ottawa, Ont.; Professor H. M. McKay, Montreal, P.Q.

The CHAIRMAN: Inasmuch as matters affecting legislation will perhaps come before these Committees, I would suggest that the gentlemen who are representing the various Provincial Governments be advised as to where the Committees will meet, so that they may have an opportunity of appearing before the Committees if they so desire.

LABOUR LAWS.

DESIRABILITY OF UNIFYING AND CO-ORDINATING LAWS OF THE DOMINION AND PROVINCES.

The Conference then took up the first item of the agenda; namely:

1. Consideration of the question of the desirability of unifying and co-ordinating the existing labour laws of the Dominion Parliament and of the Provincial Legislatures, and the consideration of any new labour laws which are deemed necessary.

Mr. J. W. BRUCE (Toronto): Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates: In introducing the first problem on the agenda, arising out of the report of the Industrial Relations Commission, I will attempt in my own way to show the necessity for co-ordinating and unifying the existing laws throughout the Dominion of Canada, and give some reasons to support my argument.

In the first place, I feel that it is useless to attempt to put things right in Europe if we are not prepared at least to attempt to put things right at home. We have a great problem confronting us, a problem so serious that it is world-wide in all its ramifications. We are to-day following the precedent established in England, where they held a convention of employers and employees; and in the United States they are arranging for a similar conference, realizing, as we have realized all through life, that labour and capital are considered the two most hostile groups in the community. In attempting to solve these problems, therefore, we must try to drop that spirit of hostility, and approach them from the standpoint of what is the greatest good for the greatest number. It is said that peace rules the day when wisdom rules the mind, and therefore I hope that in dealing

with these problems we will be guided by this main idea at all times.

The laws now on the statute books for the protection of workmen throughout the various provinces, and those under federal jurisdiction, are many in number and cover all sorts of subjects. All through the life of our movement we have had to fight a hard battle, as many of you know, against extreme hostile feeling at all times in opposition to the enactment of such legislation, many times based on sound reasoning, because of the conflicting nature of the industries involved and of the general conflicting conditions under which the workers toil. This has engendered a bitter spirit, which has been demonstrated not only in this country but throughout the world; and to-day we find generally that where labour opposes something in the nature of remedial legislation, it is a signal for a hostile position to be taken by another group in their effort to prevent that legislation being put on the statute books. All those factors, and the inequalities existing to-day because of those conflicting conditions, are among the chief reasons for a good deal of the industrial unrest. On the one hand, employers who are to be justified by the economic conditions existing and the competition engendered, protest against certain specific laws being enacted in their particular province which are not recognized or used in any other province. On the other hand, the employees feel that, if they can influence the political parties of their particular province, or at least can get the ear of Parliament to bring forward some satisfactory legislation on their behalf, they are justly entitled to do so. The mere fact of one province establishing legislation which is workable makes the workers in other provinces feel absolutely justified in appealing to the premier or government of their province to establish similar legislation. If, on the contrary, we find that this legislation is not adopted, then there is a genuine current of discontent arising, and the workers keep up an incessant fight, while on the other hand organized opposition is created in many instances, and therefore there is at all times latent a spirit of discontent that will burst into flame at the first opportunity.

In dealing with the question of unification at this particular time we have to take it out of the field of political propaganda, and look at these things from a real humane standpoint. We are not the only people who are attempting to solve this industrial problem. Even in this meeting to-day there are three groups, one representing employers, one representing employees, and what is called the third group, composed of men deeply interested in this problem from the national standpoint. Therefore, if the questions with which we are dealing are so momentous, they must be removed from the field of political propaganda and dealt with on the basis of what is best for the greatest number in the community. Are there any reasons for unification? Any one who looks over the statute books of the various provinces to-day and sees the multiplicity of laws will agree that the Commission on Industrial Relations was right in recommending that there should be at least some unification. The basis of our Peace Treaty is a desire to unify the people of the world; therefore I should say that the first line of improvement in industrial conditions should be the question of unification. At least harmony must be established where we are working under similar conditions and being governed by similar institutions. We should at least attempt to harmonize all those institutions in exactly the same ratio as we try to harmonize the conditions under which we work.

Unification must have as its basis not any particular standpoint or particular privilege; it is a question of civil rights. A citizen of this Dominion should not be compelled to work or live under conditions other than those which meet established standards; and if one province or the Federal Government can find it to the best interests of the community to establish certain standards, then an investigation of those standards should be made so that they would become the standards for all citizens of this Dominion. Industrial competition has certain disadvantage, and we find that the employers, in opposing certain progressive movements or legislation at all times refer to conditions existing elsewhere. One of the first things in the labour clauses of the Peace Treaty is that the labour convention must at least attempt to unify the working conditions of the people of this world if there is going to be an equal basis of competition. Then, as between provinces and provinces of this Dominion, the same reasoning should apply.

This question of unification, while new to us as far as our industrial problems are concerned, is not new to the Dominion of Canada, for I have in mind a meeting of the Canadian Bar Association in Winnipeg at which the necessity of unifying the civil

laws of the Dominion was discussed, and I believe this matter has been up at previous conventions of that Association, and that they are making a serious fight in connection with it. They are desirous of protecting civil rights in this Dominion, and insisting that there should be unification of civil laws. If that be a fact, we also at this time should consider the unifying of the labour laws. The multiplicity of laws and their administration have been the breeders of a great deal of discontent and ill-will throughout the provinces, and on many occasions I have had to appeal to the various governments throughout this country to do something to remove this discontent and ill-will, in an attempt to establish laws that will represent the feelings and best protect the interests of the great mass.

In the Dominion of Canada to-day we have what is known as the Industrial Disputes Act. Many of you have observed the irritation and discontent paramount at all times, not only amongst employees but also employers, because of annoying delays in matters of administration, and conflict of opinion as far as the established law is concerned. These conditions have continued until the workers themselves are entirely dissatisfied with the law. While there may be some sound principle involved in the law, the workers themselves are putting up active opposition to that law because of those irritating conditions. By an arrangement of unification, or even by a study of co-ordination, we may be in a position to remove a good deal of this irritating delay, and make for more successful administration.

Then we come to the question of workmen's compensation. I see some gentlemen around this House whom I have had the pleasure of meeting for a number of years at different times in contests before various commissions in this country in attempts to secure a better system of workmen's compensation. For many years we fought in the province of Ontario to introduce a better Workmen's Compensation Act. After a number of years we were successful in getting the Government to appoint a commission; and what has been the result? Instead of having one commission to investigate this whole problem and give us reliable data on a safe foundation, we have found that nearly every province has attempted to put into operation a Workmen's Compensation Act, and they have all sent out similar commissions to investigate conditions, doing a work similar to the others, which would have been unnecessary if there had been a recognized body as far as the Dominion of Canada is concerned, who would have been in a position to lay down fundamental standards to govern workers throughout the entire Dominion. But what do we find? That every one of those commissions arrived at different conclusions; so much so that I doubt if to-day in any country in the world, outside of the United States, you will find so many conflicting conditions and causes for irritation as in this Dominion. Take, for instance, the railroad worker in the province of Ontario who is injured; under the Workmen's Compensation Act he gets a certain reward; but if he got hurt in the province of New Brunswick, or in the province of Quebec, he would be rewarded on an entirely different basis, merely after passing that provincial dividing line. Is there any justice, is there any sense or any logic, in a condition like that? I do not feel that there is. I feel that there should be a safe basis, a safe standard, and that that standard should be the standard for all of the Compensation Acts.

Then we come to the question of Factory Acts. You will hear some employers say, "I am going to remove my factory from the province of Ontario to the province of Quebec." Why? Because of the different standards existing as far as Factory Acts are concerned. We must admit that the employer as well as the employee will resent any undue interference that he may feel, according to his own interpretation, is being imposed on him because of a particular law, when he finds that he can go to some other province where the conditions imposed and penalties exacted from him are not as onerous as those in his own province. If factory legislation is to regulate the hours of labour, if it is to protect the whole of the family life of the worker, if it is to improve the sanitary conditions that surround the worker—if those things are necessary in one province, they are necessary throughout the whole Dominion on exactly the same basis, and there should not be this differentiation.

The time when we should seriously consider this matter is now. We must remember that Lloyd George himself has said that there must be a minimum standard of existence for the residents of the British Isles. We in the various provinces throughout Canada have for a number of years fought for the establishment of minimum wage laws. In four of the provinces

we have been fairly successful in that direction, but we find exactly the same features being introduced in opposition to the operation of that minimum wage law as we found existing as far as the other laws were concerned. We find that in British Columbia they have a Minimum Wage law with a rate of $14, I believe, while in the province of Alberta there is a Minimum Wage Board and the minimum is $9 or $10.50, in the province of Saskatchewan there is a Minimum Wage law with a rate of Manitoba the minimum under the minimum rate of $14 to $15; in the pro- Minimum Wage law is $10.50. There are also different principles underlying the Acts of the various provinces, which are administered on an entirely different basis. If there is going to be any success in anything along this line there must be unanimity of opinion, there must be harmonious relationship; but you cannot establish harmonious relationship when the principles underlying a similar law are being operated differently in the various provinces.

Then we come to the question of the mining law. In our western country we find that the coal mines run under the boundary line between two provinces. We find that on one side of the boundary line the mines are in British Columbia, and on the other side they are in Alberta. The employers who are operating those different mines are selling exactly the same commodity; but, outside of certain laws established by the organizations with regard to rates of pay and hours of labour, you find an entirely different condition existing as far as the law governing mining and its enforcement are concerned. In the province of British Columbia, I understand, it is necessary to have a certificate before they can go under ground. No Oriental can be used under ground. Yet in Alberta, I understand, there are no real mining regulations.

Then you come to the other end of the country, where coal deposits exist, and there the same commodity is being sold on the same market. There, in Nova Scotia, you find a conflict of opinion between two companies whose coal runs under the sea. The people of Nova Scotia have what is considered to be good mining law, providing for ventilation and matters of that character. In New Brunswick there is no such thing as a law governing mining. The result to-day is that there are intolerable conditions in New Brunswick, where an attempt is at present being made to mine coal. Ventilation is bad; hours of labour are long; equipment is not up to the standard, and the result is that both the employer and the employee are suffering because of those conditions.

For these particular reasons I feel that there is plenty of evidence to show the need for unification. The basis of legislation must be that we are prepared to remove a good deal of the conflicting lines of thought and the antagonisms that exist. To Parliament is committed the making of law for good government and for the good of the community. But, to be satisfactory, a law must be based on investigation—not because some political party thinks that it is to its advantage to enact a certain law, but because there should be some group of citizens who are in a position to give advice to the Government in the matter of enacting the law, and in at least attempting to outline certain standards which should be factors in such a law.

Many may say that that is impossible, but I recollect that here in the Dominion we have what is called a Conservation Commission, for the conservation of the natural resources of this country, and that commission has certain powers. They are in such a position that when they determine a thing to be in the interest of the Dominion it is incumbent on the various provinces to adopt that legislation. I may be wrong in my surmise, but I believe that is the underlying factor.

Then, again, there is an International Conference. One was held at Liège and one at Berne, and the outcome of one of them, I know, is the prevention of the use of white phosphorus in the manufacture of matches. So if we can have international conferences dealing with matters that are so important, and if we can have a Federal Commission that deals with things that are essential to the conservation of our natural resources, why not let us have a commission that deals with the interests of human life, and let that commission lay down standards for all concerned.

Therefore, in this matter, I am going to make a suggestion to the Conference, in order that it may be taken up by the committee. I suggest that the Federal Government appoint a commission with three representatives from each of the provinces, one representing the Government, one the employer and one the employee, with three similar representatives selected by the Federal Government, to conduct a survey of existing laws and to consolidate the same, and to make recommendations for their unification.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW (Woodstock, Ont.) Mr. Chairman, I asked one of my colleagues, when Mr. Bruce rose to speak, who the gentleman was, and I was surprised to be told that he was one of the members of the Royal Commission whose report we are considering. I think it would have been in better taste on the part of Mr. Bruce if some one other than a member of the commission were a member of this conference. However, be that as it may, you have heard what he has to say; and we have no very great objection to it.

In the main, he seems to think that legislation is a very simple matter and that certain laws, if enacted, would be a panacea for all the ills of mankind. However, we know that history has taught us differently. One of the greatest wars, the greatest war that has ever been fought in America, was fought over the labour question of slavery in the south—the question of state rights. We in Canada are a federation of provinces strung from the Atlantic to the Pacific—admittedly a very difficult country to govern, because there is not identity of interests between the various provinces in many matters of business and production. We, however, are striving to do, under the British North America Act, the very best we can under the circumstances. It would certainly be very fine to have one law that would suit everybody in every province. Unfortunately there are industries in one province that it is not possible to have in another. Take the coal mining industry, of which Mr. Bruce spoke. The market conditions, the price of coal, and the cost of transportation, are such large factors in the question, that it would be a very difficult matter to pass common legislation in regard to hours of labour or anything else in respect to the whole industry. That only illustrates that this is a very large question and can be dealt with in a concrete way only by taking up separate subjects and dealing with them on their merits. At the conclusion of Mr. Bruce's speech he finally admitted it when he suggested that there should be a conference.

I myself was for a number of years chairman of the Legislation Committee of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and had my experience too, as well as Mr. Bruce, in endeavouring to correlate the laws of the provinces with those of the Dominion. I know how difficult a thing it was to get a Bankruptcy Act passed which would be applicable to the whole Dominion of Canada. The Dominion has jurisdiction over trade and commerce. It looks like a simple thing that we should have a common Bankruptcy Act for the whole Dominion, but it was not an easy thing to accomplish. We worked at it for years and years, and only succeeded in getting it passed at the last session of Parliament.

Take the Workmen's Compensation legislation. I was chairman of that committee of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. I put a good deal of time on the subject. We believe that we succeeded with the aid of the labour men in the city of Toronto and with the generous assistance which we received from the provincial government in evolving in the province of Ontario a very fair Workmen's Compensation law, on the whole. One would think that, after all the months that had been devoted to it, when Manitoba or Prince Edward Island or Nova Scotia was considering a Workmen's Compensation Bill, it would be satisfied to accept the result of our labour and pass a similar one; but it was not. We are democrats; we do our own thinking; conditions are not the same in each province. This was illustrated to us, and each provincial legislature acted upon its own initiative, and I think, ladies and gentlemen, that you will run up against that difficulty here.

But I would suggest that there is a way out, and that is by dealing with one particular subject at a time, and by this Conference calling upon the Minister of Justice and the Attorneys General of the provinces to get together and unify and correlate the laws of the provinces in so far as they relate generally to trade and commerce and industry. I do not like the term "labour laws." Why should we have class legislation in this country?

Mr. JOHN A. FLETT (Hamilton): Hear, hear. We agree with you.

Mr. J. R. SHAW: Now, I have embodied the kernel of what I have to say in a statement which I will read, and I am quite sure it will illustrate to you exactly the stand that we employers take on this matter. But I want it distinctly and finally understood that we are not antagonistic, that we are sympathetic, that we would like to see it done, that we will help in every way we possibly can to have it accomplished. But there are difficulties in the way. They are not insurmountable to Anglo-Saxons and to free men, but there are difficulties which we can overcome by co-operation. I will, however, point out the difficulties as I see them.

To the general idea of unifying and co-ordinating any class of law of common interest throughout Canada no exception can be taken. It must be observed, however, that owing to the magnitude of the task it would be impossible, in a Conference such as this, to deal with the subject in the concrete, or even to lay down any general principles which would be likely to be of any real assistance in working out uniform laws in any particular branch. Each branch of the subject would have to be dealt with on its merits, and the question of co-ordination or uniformity in any particular type of enactment would have to be the subject of special investigation.

If anything more is to be discussed than the general principle, it will be necessary to define the subject more exactly. The term "labour laws" must itself be defined. There has hitherto been no definite recognition, in this country, of a class of legislation peculiar to "labour." It may be necessary to consider at the outset whether any such class should be recognized. If so, to what classes of the community does it extend? Is it to constitute an exception to the generally-recognized objectionableness of "class" legislation? What is the scope and what are the aims and purposes of "labour legislation" as distinguished from other classes of legislation? Is it intended to unify and co-ordinate so-called labour laws as between the Dominion on the one hand and the provinces on the other, or is the idea merely to co-ordinate the different laws of the Dominion with each other and to treat the provincial laws on a different basis? In other words, does the proposal go to the root of the division of legislative powers as between the Dominion and the provinces established by the British North America Act?

Is the proposal to establish uniform laws as amongst the different provinces? To what extent are diversities of conditions, economical and otherwise, to be recognized? Is it seriously proposed, for instance, to have the same minimum wage law in each province, or the same laws relating to hours of labour? Is it proposed to have identical workmen's compensation acts in the different provinces? Or is it proposed that there should be one workmen's compensation system for all the provinces?

In general, it will be necessary to consider the relation of the proposal of uniform laws to the principle of local self-government. In its practical bearing it will be necessary to consider to what extent the governments and legislative bodies of the different provinces would be content to fall in with a general scheme.

The last part of the item, "consideration of any new labour laws which are deemed necessary", is obligatory and requires definition in order to receive even tentative discussion. Does it mean new "labour laws" of a kind not now in existence, or does it refer to the introduction in certain provinces of labour laws now in existence in other provinces? In its widest sense this last part of the item would cover the whole agenda. It is submitted that the last part of this item should either be defined or struck out.

These observations and criticisms are not to be taken as indicating any lack of sympathy on the part of employers with the general proposal of unifying laws where that is practicable. All we wish to do is to point out the difficulties and to assert that the main question after all must be on the merits of the particular branch of the law to be unified.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Mr. Chairman, on rising at this time, I would first like to have a clear definition as to whether there is an unanimous objection on the part of the employers of labour to hear any one who has committed the heinous offence of serving on a Government Commission. Of course, if that is the opinion, then out of respect to such an opinion I ought to take my seat, because I also chanced to be one of the individuals who served on the Industrial Relations Commission. Having done so along with my colleague, Mr. Bruce, I perhaps agree with him that we may have an equal knowledge with any other citizen of the Dominion of Canada relative to these subjects that are under discussion. If the desire of this Conference is to secure the fullest information and to find a basis possibility of agreement, then I do not think that any protest against any individual employer or employee ought to be made at this particular time. However, I am entirely in the hands of our friends, and any signified objection on their part would be sufficient for me to take my seat at this time.

SOME DELEGATES: Go on.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Hearing none, I presume the remarks of the gentleman are not concurred in by his colleagues.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW: We have no objection; we just want the public to know.

Mr. TOM MOORE: The gentleman has asked the question, why there should be labour legislation, why the term "labour laws" should be used. Perhaps that would have been a legitimate question to have been placed before the Dominion Government some two or three years ago, because for the past three years, I think, they have been issuing a booklet through the Labour Department, known as "A synopsis of Labour Legislation in the Dominion of Canada." It is issued annually, and therefore, in using the term "labour laws" we are only falling into a general expression which has been used by the Dominion Government for signifiying a certain class of legislation. Then, again, if we refer to the Treaty of Peace we find that the great statesmen of all the Allied countries determined that labour was such an important factor in the affairs of the world that it was necessary to deal with the problems of labour separately, if you please, from all the other problems which came before that particular Convention; and they suggest and arrange a Covenant known as the Labour Treaty, whereby labour men, along with employers and representatives of the Government, will be asked to meet annually for the specific purpose of dealing with and recommending to the signatories to the agreement special labour legislation. I think perhaps the gentleman who last spoke, in using the word "labour", took the narrow view of what labour really is. We all are a part of labour; do not confine labour to a man who simply uses his hands. We are of the opinion that the brain power of the manager or the genius of the inventor is just as essential labour for the advancement of civilization as the labour of a man who may operate an automatic machine in one of the factories of this country. Therefore, if you speak of labour laws, perhaps it might be more accurate to speak of them as laws relating to industrial conditions; but using the term "labour laws" I think we should be safe in saying that we should look on it in its broadest aspect and not name such laws class legislation.

In labour there is nothing to be ashamed of, and in enacting legislation for the advancement of the conditions of those who labour—and I again use the term in its broadest sense—there is nothing that should be looked upon as class legislation, because in every country a new era has dawned, and it is only to secure the benefits of that for all the citizens of our country that we are meeting here at this particular time. It is the object of Labour at all times to secure that no one shall live on the products of another, but solely by his own exertions. These are the basic principles of labour legislation.

There has been reference made to some of the inequalities of legislation. We are aware of the fact that the British North America Act defines fairly clearly the rights of the provinces; but we are also aware of the fact that the British North America Act was passed in days gone by, and we are not prepared to admit that, after the termination of a great war such as we have fought, after the sacrifice of lives which has been made, any legislation which has been enacted in the days long past should be considered as immovable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. We think that the time has arrived when it is recognized to be for the benefit of humanity that changes should be made that even the British North America Act itself should be modified.

There have been changes during the past decade, voluntary modifications, by the provinces themselves. I do not know how many provincial representatives may be here, but I do not think that they desire to maintain the prestige of a province to the disadvantage of humanity. I think that the provincial Premiers and the Provincial Governments to-day are all prepared, and have shown themselves prepared in many cases, to make the necessary modifications of their rights under the British North America Act. I have in mind certain pieces of legislation. I think we have on the statute books an Act or regulation relating to the Department of Agriculture whereby all the activities of the various Provincial Governments, as they affect the lives of horses, cows, pigs and other cattle, shall be looked after and shall be co-ordinated as far as possible.

The Dominion Government undertakes certain duties of co-ordination and issues certain pamphlets showing what has been done in the different provinces. They assist financially such provinces as voluntarily relinquish some of their prerogatives in order that the stock of the country shall be improved. If that is possible with the agriculture and the live stock of this country, is it not possible to do something similar when human begins are concerned?

We have had during the last session of Parliament a Bill introduced known as

the Federal Health Bureau Act. It was introduced if I am not mistaken by the gentleman sitting alongside of our Chairman. (Hon. N. W. Rowell). That Act provides for the co-ordination of the different provincial health bureaus relating to the securing of information, and provides for assistance through investigation and research for the benefit of the provinces, and the Federal Government is taking the initiative in placing before the provinces what it thinks would be advisable to unify and improve health conditions throughout the entire Dominion. During the past session we have had an Act known as the Technical Education Act, whereby a sum of money is to be appropriated and to be distributed among the provinces in aid of the education of the peoples of those provinces, providing that the provinces themselves voluntarily accept the recommendations and the standards laid down for that class of education, and I am inclined to think that the provinces of this country will voluntarily modify their prerogatives as far as that is concerned. When the soldiers returned from overseas the prerogatives of the provinces relative to education were modified so that a unified system of training for the benefit of these men could be undertaken by the Dominion Government. The provinces set up separate systems of employment bureaus, but we have had them co-ordinating their efforts and accepting the assistance of the co-ordinating departments of the Federal Government, so that the returns in all the provinces relative to unemployment and other problems could be tabulated as federal information.

Therefore, with these examples before us, I just want to conclude by asking the question: do the gentlemen recognize that there would be benefit in undertaking co-ordination in the legislation affecting all labour matters? If so, we have agreed that the best way to do that is by an investigation, and that capital, labour, and the community through the Government of each province, should meet together and study the entire problem and bring in recommendations. There is nothing in the recommendation that we have made suggesting that this should be compulsory on the provinces; it is only a suggestion that, if the British North America Act caused conflict, we should remember that we are not nine different countries, and that we should attempt to do something to bring about a united Canada in this respect.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW: To Mr. Moore's question I will answer, yes. Possibly he may not be aware that at the suggestion of the Bar Association of the Dominion a number of the provincial Governments have appointed commissions for the very purpose which he has mentioned.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER (Toronto): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. Before I address myself to the matter in hand, I should like to make one or two observations with regard to the previous speakers—not of course my colleagues on this side, but those on the other side.

First, as to the allusion to the fact that certain speakers have served upon a certain commission. May I say that, as I understood the remarks from this side, it was merely to point out for the benefit of those who were not informed, that there had been that connection with the commission. It was not intended to suggest anything more than that. Whether or not any such service would mean any bias is another matter, and must be left to the judgment of the individual knowing the facts. May I trust that, the facts being known, the incident may be allowed to pass? As far as I am concerned, it has passed.

May I, in sincere language and not because I desire to offer mere empty compliments, pay quite sincere tribute to the speakers on the other side? I felt that Mr. Bruce showed that not only was he exceedingly earnest and concerned about the subject-matter in hand, but, also that he had devoted some considerable time to the subject with which he was dealing. As to Mr. Moore, to pay compliments would be absolutely a work of supererogation, the talents which he has are evident to us all.

Now, there are one or two things that I should like to clear up, not wholly from a selfish standpoint. In the first place, it seems to me that all of us who are here observing, and especially those of us who at times may speak, should not feel too greatly burdened with the seriousness of the occasion. I am one of those who feel it very deeply, and to those who are suffering with me, I point out that, after all, the efforts and powers of all of us are limited. We can but do our best in our several positions.

Let me make myself clear as to how we represent the bodies we are intended to represent. Obviously I have not had any opportunity of consulting the large constituency, if I may so call it, which I represent. Therefore, if I should for a moment depart from the absolutely right course, those I represent are not to be

charged with my fault. It seems to me that if we bear that in mind we shall go into this happy task, for it is a task, with lighter and cheerier hearts.

We are to a certain extent ranged in camps which are apparently opposed to one another, and I wish to emphasize that word "apparently." I was greatly delighted to hear the largest possible reference made to the meaning of the word "labourer." I am a labourer, and have always been a labourer, and I suppose I should offer a pious hope that to my last day I may remain a labourer, since he only is happy who is engaged in work.

Now, as a labourer, how am I to address those who happen to be seated opposite to me? We heard yesterday from several gentlemen, and I agreed with them, that the great object of us all should be as far as possible to learn the point of view of those opposite. May I use language which in my humble judgment expresses it? We always fail in our duties to our fellowmen unless to the extent that we can do so, we get right into his skin and look upon the world through his eyes; and, though I may fail, I shall at least attempt that task. May I say that whenever I am addressing a fair audience, or taking part in the deliberations of a body which is more or less consultative in its attitude, I am reminded of that splendid American stateman, in my humble judgment one of the finest men that ever breathed the breath of life, Abraham Lincoln, and his historical utterance, "Malice towards none."

Now, having said that, I have apparently to take an attitude against that taken by those on the other side; but I wish to emphasize the word "apparently", because, after all, it seems to me that there is no fundamental difference between us on this subject. We are all perfectly open to give a counsel of perfection to the Dominion and to the different provinces. There is only one difference which occurs to me, and it is an immense difference, because when you come to consider this point of the agenda, what does it mean?

I have to hurry, so you must permit me to speak as though I were an oracle, when I should prefer to argue the question. There are these possible interpretations: does it mean the uniform action of the several provinces alone? Does it mean uniformity of action between one or two or three or more provinces? Does it mean uniformity of the laws of one or two or three or more provinces? Does it mean uniformity of the laws of the Dominion in themselves? Does it mean uniformity of the laws as between the several provinces of the Dominion? Unless it is limited to the first meaning, it means that at once you realize—what is so tremendously dear, shall I say, at least, of such immense concern to all of us—that it should be clearly shown what are the several rights of the provinces on the one hand and of the Dominion on the other. It is not a small question; it is not a thing that we should dispose of even in the most elementary way by reference to a committee.

In my judgment, there is a difficulty beyond that again. It is: what am I going to unify towards? You must have a standard towards which you are moving. In a sense it occurs to me the consideration of this item at this time is putting the cart before the horse. What is the design here? It is to set a standard satisfactory to the people at large throughout the Dominion. But we have not got our standard. It is not even suggested that any legislation, whether of the Dominion on the one hand or the several provinces on the other, is standard legislation. In fact, if we are to pay due attention to what we have heard this morning, there is no such standard; so how are we to attempt to arrive at it unless by the consideration of the items of the agenda that come after this one? I suggest to you, fellow labourers, on that side, and to you, fellow labourers on this side, that if we really discuss this matter fully at the present time we are in fact wasting the time of the Conference, because it will be found that when the Committee goes into session it has really nothing to deal with. My only suggestion, therefore, is that we take up the concrete suggestions contained in the agenda, hoping that out of their consideration some solution may arise; then, perhaps, but certainly in my judgment not until then, can we with any hope of success or any satisfaction deal with this item number one.

I thank you for listening so patiently to these hurried remarks.

Mr. JAMES SIMPSON (Toronto): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I think it is the desire that we shall make as rapid and as sensible progress in this Conference as possible. Listening, as I did attentively, to the addresses of the representatives of the employers, I was exceedingly gratified to know that upon the main proposition now before the Conference there was general agreement. That is, there is an ex-

pressed desire on the part of not only the representatives of labour on this side, but—shall I be permitted to call them also representatives of labour, on that side—that there should be some effort made to unify the laws of the various provinces that have to do with the conditions that obtain in industry, and also the conditions which govern the men and women who work in the industries of this country.

We are agreed upon that, I think because we realize that the methods that have been employed by the various provinces in preparing their evidence and information on which to base legislation have indicated the necessity of greater uniformity, after each province has made its own effort to enact laws which labour representatives in their own interest, and for their protection, had desired to be placed on the statute book. As an illustration of what I mean, let me say that, when the agitation from the ranks of organized Labour grew all over the country in favour of workmen's compensation, it was not every Provincial Government that listened to the appeal at the same time. Consequently, that province which listened to the appeal of labour would appoint a Commission, have a thorough investigation, and then endeavour to base its statutes upon information and evidence that was adduced before that particular commission. In the opinion of the Legislature of that particular province, the statute that was passed embodied the best that could be accomplished in the interest of those who appealed for that class of legislation. Naturally, after that law was enacted it was pointed out that if the province of Ontario or the province of British Columbia had a workmen's compensation law which more adequately protected the worker and his dependents, it would be a good thing for the other provinces in the country to copy that precedent.

Now, in the very process of the enactment of this legislation it has been clearly shown that there are differentiations which are entirely unjust when we consider the basis upon which that legislation has been enacted. What I mean by that is this: that if a rate of compensation has been determined as being 55 per cent, being based upon equity, and another province has decided that the basis of compensation should be 100 per cent of a man's earnings for an entire year, and that he is entitled to that compensation, then it is the duty of somebody—whether it be a private individual, or the Attorneys General and other responsible representatives of Government, or whether it be the Provincial and Federal Governments in agreement—in my judgment, and the judgment of the men for whom I speak, that there should be some effort to establish in the various provinces of this country a workmen's compensation law which in equity would be the same in one province as another, and deal as justly with the workers in one province as the workers in another. I am satisfied that the judgment of the employers who are here this morning agrees with our judgment in this matter. What claim can be made that a worker in Saskatchewan is entitled to 100 per cent of his earnings for one year, while in Ontario he is only entitled to 55 per cent? Take another Act. At a recent meeting of the Legislature they saw fit to amend the law giving to the widows of men who had been killed in industry an annual allowance of $20 a month, and an allowance to each child of $7.50 instead of $5 a month. Is that the law in every other province of Canada? Not at all. Therefore there is another element introduced into that law which is supposed to be more equitable than the clause which preceded it. Thus I might go on elaborating as to one law after another in the province of Ontario which should be very carefully considered, so as to show that a better basis of equity should be adopted towards those who are involved.

Let me say to the employers, as I have this privilege of speaking, that if I interpret aright the intentions of the men who are on this side, irrespective of the opinions we hold as men—for we may be called ultra-radical, moderates, or reactionary—I am satisfied that every man who is here this morning has come with the earnest desire, irrespective of his love for radicalism, or anything, to establish a better basis for the relations between employers and employees. Therefore I want to say that there is another point of agreement—and I would like to interject this, that the last time I saw Mr. Gitor was when we were sitting together upon a railroad tie in our pyjamas, after going through a railroad wreck, and we established a fraternity at that time which perhaps it would be well for us to maintain. I was going to say that we are perfectly in agreement in the task which has been suggested by the recommendations of the Commission on Industrial Relations, and which has been dealt with by us in the recommendations which we are placing before the conference. We recognize the tremendousness of the task that will confront such a Commission if it is appointed, the difficulties that would face the Attorney

General and the other representatives of Government mentioned by Mr. Shaw. We recognize that no matter who undertakes this tremendous task, it is difficult, and the conditions that prevail in the different provinces will have to be considered, and the differentiations will have to be taken into account.

Therefore we are agreed as to the necessity of the uniformity of the laws; we recognize the tremendous difficulties in the way; and I feel that there is no question in this Conference on which there will be as much agreement as the present one; I would therefore suggest that, instead of laying this question aside, it should be decided on this basis, that the recommendation suggested by Mr. Bruce, who represented the labour side of this question, should go to the Committee, to see if we could not draft a recommendation that would meet the views of this Conference. Then we will make progress, whereas if we agree to lay this over, I am satisfied we will meet other questions that will have to be laid over, and we have only five days for the accomplishment of the biggest task that was ever assigned to employers and employees in Canada. I am satisfied as to the necessity of unification, satisfied as to the difficulties in the way; but I believe we are big enough men to solve the problem that is before us this morning.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW: If Mr. Simpson will move that that item be referred to the Committee, I will second it; or if he will move that Item No. 1 be laid over for further discussion at this Conference, I will second it.

Mr. SIMPSON: I will move that the Item be referred to the Committee, with the recommendation as suggested by Mr. Bruce. I was going to move that the matter be referred to the Committee, with instructions to bring in a recommendation in harmony with the resolution.

Mr. TOM MOORE: And the discussion.

Mr. SIMPSON: And the discussion, certainly.

Mr. SHAW: I will not agree to that. I am willing that the matter be referred to the Committee without the discussion, without prejudice to the views of my colleagues.

Mr. TOM MOORE: We understand clearly from Mr. Shaw that it is the desire to have the Committee bring in the resolution, and that it is the desire that they shall take into consideration the recommendations made on our behalf and also the discussion, and the subjects mentioned by the other side in the discussion. Is that the understanding?

Mr. SHAW: No, I am not going to tie the hands of the Committee.

Mr. TOM MOORE: They are not tied; it is only to consider.

Mr. J. W. BRUCE: My own understanding of this matter was that there should be an open discussion, with a reference of the subject-matter to the Committee to draft a resolution based on the understanding on both sides, and then to return the matter to the floor of this Conference, to see if it would carry the vote of this Conference.

Mr. SHAW: Refer the matter to the Committee without any instructions tied to it, and I will second it.

Mr. BRUCE: I move that this subject-matter be referred to the Committee to bring forward a definite resolution.

Mr. SHAW: I will second that motion.

Mr. SIMPSON: That is quite agreeable to me.

The CHAIRMAN: Agreeably to the mode of procedure decided on this morning when you adopted the report of the Committee on Arrangements, it is now moved and seconded that the subject-matter contained in Clause No. 1 of the revised agenda be now referred to the appropriate Committee for consideration. What is the will of the Conference?

The motion was put and carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the Committee upon whom devolves the task of considering this item in the agenda make proper announcement of the time and place of meeting, so that those desiring to appear before the Committee, particularly the representatives of the Provincial Governments who are here, may have the opportunity if they so desire?

HOURS OF LABOUR.

DISCUSSION OF RECOMMENDATION OF INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION.

The CHAIRMAN: The next order of business will be Item No. 2 on the revised agenda:

2. Consideration of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations respecting hours of labour.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Is it decided that the question shall be introduced from one side of the House on every occasion, or are we going to alternate, out of respect to our friends? I would suggest that we alternate. I do not think we desire to "hog" it on this side; and, we having presented one topic, I think that the opposite side may very properly take the lead in the next matter.

Mr SHAW: It would be perfectly agreeable to us, Mr. Moore, if you introduced the subject each time.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Mr. Chairman, in harmony with the remark that we have the ability to do that, I will ask Brother McClelland to introduce the subject.

Mr. J. A. McCLELLAND (Montreal): Mr. Chairman, fellow delegates: In the opening speeches we heard yesterday all the speakers commented on the importance of this gathering, and all seemed to agree that there was great necessity for it, which would presuppose that there was considerable unrest in the country, or a Conference would not be necessary to bring the different parties together. None of the speakers, however, proposed any panacea for the difficulty, and rightly so. They all have hopes that this Conference will at least minimize the difficulties that are confronting this country at the present time on the questions that we are here to discuss.

On the agenda supplied us we have numerous topics of a more or less contentious nature, but I venture to say that there is no question on the agenda that has caused or is causing greater misunderstanding throughout the industries of this country than the question of the hours of labour. For a number of years past, and at the present time, the workers have been demanding that the hours of labour be shortened, and before the employers, many of whom are here, they have been putting forward their different reasons for this change in conditions. Always, invariably—at least, this happened some little time ago—we were charged, as all the organizations here are aware, with a studied attempt to reduce the output of the factory, or to entirely cripple the industry. Many of the gentlemen here are aware that those charges are being laid against us from time to time because of our efforts to reduce the hours of labour. We have endeavoured at all times to demonstrate that our object was not to cripple the industry. We have no reason to do that, as is obvious, but we have some reason to try and preserve the health and promote the happiness of the workers of the Dominion of Canada. There have been reams of paper used in giving reports of investigations made on this subject. I am sure the employers who are here have read these reports; we know many of them have; and we know that many of the employers of labour are agreed that the shorter work-day is something that should obtain everywhere. Many of the gentlemen who are here have agreed along these lines and have signed agreements to that effect. But that is not going far enough. What we are here to-day for is to try to reach a common understanding, in order that we may ask the Government that legislation be enacted making the forty-four hour week, or the eight-hour day, applicable all over the Dominion of Canada and in all industries.

We have here some data. I do not intend to read it all, Mr. Chairman, but in the memorandum that has been supplied us with the agenda it is evident that we are not asking for something that does not apply elsewhere—that we are not trying to break in on something new, for we find under the caption of "The Eight-hour Day Movement Abroad," in the memorandum printed with the proposed agenda, the names of the countries where such legislation has been enacted. I do not consider that it is worth my while reading it; you all have copies.

There are other matters, though, in connection with the question that it might probably be well to read. I have here something that has been published by Lord Henry Bentinck, M.P. He makes a very exhaustive report, after investigation, on the question of the shorter work-day. To read all of it, which is very important, would be altogether unnecessary; but with reference to certain portions of the argument in favour of the eight-hour day, I will read one excerpt.

> It is certain that unless our industrial life is to be gutted in the future by the application of physiological science to the details of the management, it cannot hope to maintain its position hereafter among some of its foreign rivals, who already in that respect have gained a present advantage.

He goes on to demonstrate that the shorter work-day is favourable to increased output in industry. He goes further than merely to consider the investigations of the present day; he goes back as far as 1843 and continues his examination right up to 1918. One other part of this report I will read. I will place it all in evidence before the Committee and the members of the Committee can examine it themselves. I

am just picking out little pieces. He says, referring to the year 1893, that under the forty-eight hour week production increased as against the fifty-three hour week previously in operation. Though the piece-workers lost slightly during the year, their falling-off diminished as the year advanced, showing a steady adaptation to the altered conditions of work. He goes on to say that in the first three months they earned 1.76 per cent less than the standard piece rates, and the decrease was gradually reduced until they were earning more money in the smaller number of hours. He says further that the time lost under the fifty-three hour week averaged 2.46 per cent, whereas under the forty-eight hour system it was reduced to 0.46 per cent. The health of the employees having been so vastly improved by the shortened hours, by the recreation they were able to obtain, by the fact of their having something other to do than simply to work and sleep, the effect of the shorter hours was that the workmen were better able to attend to their duties day after day without any loss of time.

He goes on to give an Admiralty Report and demonstrates that, after trying the reduced hours for eleven years, the Admiralty reported that the cost of production at the dockyards compared favourably with the cost previous to the introduction of the forty-eight hour week. He is unable to give exact data. Of course, the Government do not publish those matters very quickly.

I point this out to show that these statements of Lord Bentinck and of many others who have made investigations in this matter substantiate the statements that we have made from time to time on this particular point, and that our efforts are not directed, nor is there any underlying motive for endeavouring, to reduce or curtail output, when we claim a reduction in the working hours.

As I have said, there are many employers here who are favourable to the shorter work-day. There are a number who are entirely opposed to it. It is the opinion of the committee members from this side who have been charged with introducing this topic that we should simply bring forward a recommendation on the floor, so that the discussion can be continued on that recommendation or on the subject-matter of our introduction. We do not intend to take up the half-hour that has been allowed us. This matter is so widespread and covers so much ground that if we even attempted to cover the ground adequately, we could not do so in the time that has been allotted. We have, however, as I have said, a large amount of data here to substantiate the claims that we have been making from time to time. We intend to place this before the Committee, and the recommendation of the Royal Commission is the recommendation of our Committee, that the forty-four hour week be inaugurated by legislation in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW (Woodstock, Ont.): I would suggest that evidence that is not submitted to this Conference in open meeting, should not go before the Committee.

Mr. J. A. McCLELLAND (Montreal): Mr. Chairman, we have purposely endeavoured to procure as much evidence as we possibly could, so that the Committee should have something on which to base their recommendations to be submitted to this meeting. I think that if the Committee are going to bring in an intelligible report or recommendation, either one way or the other, they must have an understanding of what has taken place in other parts of the world, and we have not the time to repeat it here for the sake of our records.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW: I submit that it is the Committee's business to endeavour to interpret the opinion of this open meeting as it develops in the discussion and to bring in a report upon those lines. If the Committee is to retire to the Library on the Hill and dig up all sorts of information on every subject, and then bring in its report, it is not functioning as we suppose it ought to do.

Mr. R. A. RIGG (Winnipeg): With regard to this matter which has just been projected before the Conference, I think it would be a very serious mistake to adopt any cast-iron regulation with regard to the procedure in Committee. There are many interested in this Conference. The Committee on Arrangements yesterday were brought face to face with the fact that there were present here a number of gentlemen representing specific interests who felt that they had not been given the proper status at the Conference, particularly by exclusion from representation on committees, and the Conference has to-day modified its policy with regard to them and given them representation. Now, we have sitting here in the centre of this Chamber gentlemen representing the provincial legislatures of Canada. Their counsel may be very necessary to some of those committees. There may be ladies or gentlemen attending this Con-

ference whom the committees may think it desirable to consult with regard to matters that may come before them before they specifically determine what the nature of their resolutions shall be, and I think myself that we should be adopting a very unwise policy and injuriously restricting the scope of our committees not to permit of some representations being made in Committee. I am speaking of general policy and not particularly with regard to the matter which is immediately before the Conference now. I think it is a very bad policy to surround the committees with the condition that there shall be no intrusion after the subject-matter has been referred from the Conference. It may be very vitally necessary, in order to enlighten the mind of the Committee, that there shall be access to opinion outside the Committee itself.

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen: The Chair is of the opinion that the Convention ought to follow the procedure that it adopted yesterday upon the recommendation of the Committee on Arrangements, and that is, that no Committee shall draft any resolution until after the subject has been discussed in the Conference. I do not think that the subject that is now before you, in view of its great importance to all concerned, has as yet been thoroughly or frankly discussed, and I would suggest that the Conference proceed at some length to hear opinions that may be held by delegates representing both interests, before we refer this important question to a Committee.

Mr. M. P. WHITE (Toronto): Mr. Chairman, I rather think that the gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. McClelland) should go on and place his reasons for advocating the eight-hour day at this time before the whole Conference. It is very necessary for the Conference to know the basis of the reasons for a shorter day. If we do not have that evidence from the employees' side, and we have evidence on the question from our side, how can the Conference come to any definite decision in the matter? I think the evidence which he states he has to submit to the Committee is of very great importance, and that, while it may be lengthy, he should at least give the gist of it to the Conference for the information of every one here.

Mr. J. A. McCLELLAND: Mr. Chairman, we are interested in the shorter work-day, as I intimated, in the first instance, from the standpoint of the benefits to the worker. As I have stated, we believe that the workers have some other thing to do in life than simply to work and sleep; and under the longer hours it has been found that the worker, when he returns to his home in the evening, has no ambition for anything but simply to go to bed. The first investigation by Lord Bentinck, which is recorded here, was begun at a time when it was much easier to work the longer hours than it is to-day, and yet the investigating Committee found it then necessary to recommend a reduction of working hours for the sake of the health of the employees. At that time the methods of manufacturing were altogether different from what they are to-day. In all the industries of the country, or at least in the majority of them. With the introduction of improved machinery the pace has been made so fast that it is absolutely impossible for the worker to maintain it for any great length of time. The result is invariably that he falls ill, and his family or those dependent upon him suffer in consequence. We have endeavoured to shorten the working hours for that reason, amongst many others. We have here an interview with Sir Robert Hadfield, published in 1917, in which he refers to the matter of the shorter work-day in these terms:

> He noted that for years employers in England had made an earnest and unanimous fight against the forty-eight hour week. "Now, under war conditions," he continued, "when it is necessary that we should produce at a maximum, we have turned to it, as a means to just that end, and find it most efficient.... When the war broke out it was no longer a question of the greatest number of hours for the least pay; it had become a question of the greatest output in the shortest space of time.

It was considered advisable, then, in order to increase the output, to shorten the working day. Therefore the workers must to some extent be benefitted physically.

We have the report of an investigation made by the Labour Bureau in the United States with reference to the shorter working day. Evidence was given by forty-six industrial physicians. Amongst other things they say:

> A number of physicians gave as their reason for advocating the eight-hour day that it makes for a more efficient working force, and so favours both employer and employee. One physician (supervising a department store) giving eight to ten hours as the best length for the working day stated that longer hours were possible for the girls under his supervision because the work in that store was easy and the conditions good, but that his reply referred to his own industry alone. One physician advocating the eight-hour day stated that hours should be fewer than eight for workers in "hazardous" or "nervous" occupations.

Most of our occupations are nervous and hazardous, or come under that head.

The workers want to be able to enjoy more of the daylight. Some have been referring to saving daylight. I merely take this matter up from the standpoint of the workman, from what I get from him from day to day as to the effect of the shorter working-day on industry. I thought that argument was the one that would be adduced if there was any opposition, and that is what I would base my argument upon. I have produced a number of reports here showing earnings in different industries under the shorter work-day as against the earnings under the longer-hour system, which demonstrates the fact that the employees are better able to conduct their business under the shorter work-day. I have here, "The Eight-Hour Day Defined." It is Research Report No. 11, 1918, issued by the National Industrial Conference of the United States. That is an organization whose members, I think, might be called the American Manufacturers' Association. Amongst other things they say:

> This system does not involve any organized overtime. While its adoption may be based in part on the same grounds as are urged for the straight eight-hour day, it is a product of industrial organization and not of legislative enactment. Its effect upon output is radically different from that of the straight eight-hour day, while as a wage measure it differs from the basic eight-hour day. As against either of these arrangments, the eight-hour shift system obviously increases total production, while it lessens production cost by offsetting the burden of idle machinery and other overhead expense.

I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that I need go any further than the Report of our Royal Commission on Industrial Relations. That Commission travelled through Canada and brought in recommendations as a result of exhaustive interviews with the different peoples throughout the country, both employers and employees. While you have the report before you, yet I shall ask your indulgence while I read a portion of it to you. It says:

> We found at the great majority of places visited a demand by the workers for a shorter working day, based on their desires for more leisure and energy to devote to the things of life other than work, and a general approval by the employers in regard to this.
>
> Many opinions were expressed by workers on this proposition. The most common request was for an eight-hour day with the Saturday half holiday, where already established, and its further extension wherever possible, thus making the forty-four hour week.

Then follows a statement of the difficulties with which they were faced. Then they go on to say:

> In many industries in Canada the eight-hour day has already been adopted, and it has been recognized by the Peace Treaty. We recommend that it be established by law throughout the Dominion, with due regard for the above considerations. Such legislation should provide for a weekly rest of at least twenty-four hours, which should include Sunday whenever practicable.

When we talk of a shorter work-day, some of the employers here will probably be surprised to know that in the Dominion of Canada the workers are not all working on the basis of a nine-hour or an eight-hour day, but that there are many employees who are working from ten to twelve hours a day. I am given to understand that in some of the mills the hours average about twelve hours a day.

We have endeavoured by means of many arguments to carry the judgment of the employers to the point of reducing the number of working hours for the sake of the health of their employees. In many instances we have found it impossible to get them to do so. What we ask for is legislation to bring that about, so that if an employer is not disposed to grant a shorter work-day along with other employers in the country, he should be compelled to do so. We want legislation along this line.

The CHAIRMAN: As many of the delegates were not present to punch the clock promptly at 10 o'clock this morning, if it is agreeable, I would suggest that we go on for a few minutes more.

Mr. A. B. WEEKS: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that if we are to extend the session to make up the time lost this morning, possibly it would be inadvisable to have an afternoon session, cramping the noon period, which might result in further lateness this afternoon.

Mr. JAMES H. ASHDOWN (Winnipeg): Mr. Chairman, have I as an individual a right to speak before this Convention, or is the matter left to the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: You have the same privilege as every other delegate.

Mr. JAMES H. ASHDOWN: Then I want to say a word on this question. I want to say that the employer, if he is a wise man, has an equal interest with anybody else in the health and happiness of his employees. It is to his interest that

his employees should have health, otherwise they cannot do their work. It is to his interest that they should have happiness, and if it is possible to give happiness under a different condition of affairs which he can bring about, it is in the interest of the employer that that should be done.

I should like to see this question go to the Committee. It is a question that the Labour Party feels very strongly about. For my part, I may say, that for some time past we have agreed, and a larg portion of the community of Winnipeg have also agreed, to the forty-four hour week; that is, eight hours for the first five days, and four hours for the last day. But in our retail business we find it not reasonable to close at 12 o'clock on Saturday. There are a great many people, among them many of the labour element, who want to get tools or supplies so that they may do some work for themselves on Saturday afternoon. That puts a retail business in a little different position to others, and no doubt there are other lines which are similarly affected.

When a forty-four hour week is asked for, it might be found, if it were enacted, that it was going altogether too far, and I think it is a matter that a Committee might well deal with and report upon. It is one of those matters that should be referred to the Dominion Government to deal with. I should certainly like to see the matter go to the Committee.

The Conference adjourned at 12.30.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Conference resumed at 2.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been brought to our attention that in the report of yesterday's proceedings some delegates present were not mentioned. All corrections will be made to-day, and if any who were present but not so reported will notify the Secretary, we will see that their names are inserted in the report.

We will now proceed with the business where we left off before luncheon.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW (Woodstock, Ont.): Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of privilege. At the lunch hour I was mildly criticised by some of my colleagues because they thought I had apparently insisted that the employees should open every question. I did not intend to convey the impression that we should have the advantage of being on the defensive all the time. I merely thought that as the employees were represented by men who have been giving this matter a life study, and we were a bunch of amateurs—busy manufacturers—they could open the matter better than we could, and we would endeavour to meet the arguments as best we might. I have this to say, however, that if it is agreeable we will open the questions alternately.

Another matter: I noticed in the Montreal Gazette a glaring headline that we are divided—employers on the one side and labour on the other; that already antagonism had been manifested. I think that that headline creates a very false impression. The only reason we are divided is because we wish to sit together, because we must consult, and it would be very inconvenient if we were mixed up and could not chat with our friends about points as they arise; and I want it distinctly understood that there is no antagonism, and that we are only sitting separately for our personal convenience in handling the situation in the quickest and best possible manner.

HOURS OF LABOUR.

THE DISCUSSION CONTINUED.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now be glad to hear from the next speaker who desires to discuss the subject.

Mr. M. P. WHITE (Toronto): Ladies and Gentlemen: The hours of labour of the people of Canada, whether for physical or mental work, are truly expressed by the sum-total of that production of the necessaries and luxuries and business of life which our people require in their daily or yearly rounds. The relative position of capital is truly expressed in the accumulated labour or energy represented by all the knowledge, experience and system, plant, equipment and conveniences which the people have at their disposal in the production required. These two chief factors in national welfare must and do operate together to produce the nation's needs. If the supply is large we have industrial prosperity, if small we have industrial depression. The foundation of industrial prosperity is therefore production; the real wealth produced consists of goods, not money. The amount available for distribution, or what represents the standard of living of the people, depends entirely upon the amount produced.

We are asked to consider the reduction of the hours of labour by legislation over the whole of Canada, so that eight hours will become the standard of a day's work for all classes of industry. It seems to

me that this proposal should have very serious investigation and consideration before any action so far-reaching and powerful as legislation is taken. There are a number of phases to the hours of labour question. Apparently good reasons can be advanced in favor of reduction, but there are also vital reasons why we should not at the present time do anything to restrict or lessen production or increase cost in all those industries essential to the prosperity of the nation.

Let us examine some of the reasons why hours of labour should not be reduced from what they are, and then compare them with the reasons advanced for reduction, so that we may more clearly draw the conclusions as to which side carries the most weight.

The first thing to consider in regard to a reduction in hours of labour is the effect on production. If the material welfare of the people depends on production, as I have explained, then surely the first duty of the people in their own best interests is to see that enough is produced to meet all requirements and obligations. It is apparent to most of us that our ordinary requirements are greater than they were before the war, and in addition we have to meet the great extra strain left upon our shoulders by the war, a share of the responsibility for which belongs to every citizen of Canada and may rightly be called the price of freedom. And there is a further obligation still which, if not compulsory, should rest with equal weight upon us all, and that is the call of the distressed peoples of the war-devastated regions great areas where production has been paralyzed and where it will take years for the machinery of industry to get going again on normal lines. There is great suffering there for want of the very necessaries of life. They need supplies and may not have the means to pay? Is it or is it not up to the citizens of this great industrially-unharmed Canada, not only to find the way to take care of our own needs, but to find time and the will to produce something worthy of our name and reputation to assist these people who have suffered infinitely worse than we have from the war? Are we Canadians, with all our facilities and ability to help supply these needs, going to sit down and say, "No, these obligations are none of ours; we must have greater ease, no matter what happens, our health demands it; there is a feeling among our people that they must have it." If such ideas exist, it is because those who have them do not understand the truth about the situation.

Is Canada over-produced or under-produced at the present time? Is she going on at an over-producing rate at this moment? I know that radical fellows are going about telling our people that we are over-produced; they say that is the reason for unemployment; that the high cost of living is due entirely to control of the products by so-called capital interests; that if only profits could be cut out everything would come down in price and the situation be saved for the employees. There are some industries which are over-producing, the luxury industry, the amusement industry, and others which have to do with extravagance. Great numbers of employees in such industries will have to be turned into more necessary production if we are to do the right thing by ourselves and the world.

The real fact is that Canada, like every other country, is very much under-produced in all her essential industries. That is the basic reason for the high cost of living everywhere, and there can be no cure for the present very unwholesome state of affairs except through the medium of increasing production. It can be shown that we have a large job on our hands which will take our utmost energy. We must cut extravagance and concentrate on healthy hard work.

I believe that the average hours of labour at the present time throughout Canada are over 50 per week. We are asked to consider a reduction to a maximum of 44 per week. This would mean a reduction of six hours per week, or 12 per cent of the total hours worked, and a corresponding reduction in output. It is estimated that the total value of Canada's annual production for 1917 was approximately $4,600,000,000; and assuming that should be possible, still, it would, if reduced by 12 per cent leave a total of $4,048,000,000, or an annual loss in production of $552,000,000. Can there be found by any possible stretch of imagination any real compensating benefit to the people of Canada through an act of legislature which involves such startling consequences as that.

Canada's total debt in 1914 was $350,000,000. Canada's total debt at the present time is $1,650,000,000, or $770,814,000 more than in 1917.

In 1914 Canada required a revenue of $163,174,000, in 1917, of $232,701,000. For 1919 Canada requires a revenue of $437,679,000. This shows that we should produced for 1919, in addition to our regular needs, enough to pay a revenue of $205,178,000 more than we did in 1917, our biggest year.

When we look squarely at the fact that, instead of creating a condition which involves a loss of $552,000,000 per annum in production, we must find the means to produce the value of $205,178,000 more than we did in 1917 in order to meet ordinary requirements and without considering increased needs and other obligations, we must surely see that our economic position is not to be taken lightly. And there are additional losses of productive power which must be considered: the many thousands of aliens who have left the country, the absence of five years of immigration, the 60,000 good men who did not come back, the reduced efficiency of many thousands of returned men, and the greatly reduced efficiency of great numbers of workers who have already developed easy-going habits. It is impossible to estimate just what these amount to, but they are very serious.

One thing is sure: it does not look like a time to be cutting down hours of labor, but rather to be searching for every possible means of increasing our efficiency, for we must do a very great deal along that line if we are to thrive under the burden which is ours to shoulder.

The second thing to be considered in regard to the reduction in hours is its effect on costs. If the hours are reduced from 50 to 44 hours per week, it means an increase in overhead charges of about 13 per cent, and if the same rate of wages is to be paid for 44 hours as for 50, that adds 13 per cent to the net labour, or a total of 13 per cent increase in net cost. Apply this schedule to all the industries which produce necessities and you get a definite and direct increase in the cost of living without considering the effect on other elements of cost to the consumer, who, by the way, is largely the worker himself.

If we couple this increased actual cost with the actual diminished output, and bring our minds face to face with the fact that the output is already far short of requirements, surely it is not difficult to see that such action promises no material benefit to the worker, but only leads to further trouble, and if forced upon the country must inevitably end in very serious industrial depression and hardship.

The matter of costs has a very definite influence on foreign trade. Our export trade is rapidly falling off; our money is at a discount in the United States; it costs us $2.50 on every $100 we spend over there—a most undignified state of affairs as well as involving serious loss when it comes to an adverse balance of $400,000,000 a year against us.

There should be a greater market than ever before for what Canada can produce. Bear in mind that other countries are also under-produced, that the surplus of world's necessities is exhausted, that untold millions worth of human energy has been spent in destruction. The volume of our foreign business depends chiefly on one thing, the ability to sell in competition with other nations and hence on our cost of production. If we cannot meet the price offered we cannot sell, and we are losing vast business at the present time on that account. If we cannot get our share of foreign trade, how can we pay our debts? The only way to meet our great financial obligations is to produce the necessary quantity of goods to sell in the foreign markets.

If we allow our costs to go so high that we cannot meet competition, it involves not only the loss of business from outside, but also the danger that other countries will flood our markets with their goods at prices below our costs and so cause industrial depression both ways.

The matter of foreign trade is so important and the cost of production so vital to its maintenance that I urge again the necessity for greater efficiency and more work. The obligation is positive; we cannot escape it; we have got to put forth much greater effort than ever before and we have got to make every citizen realize it. Who can honestly, in the face of this, stand up and say, "We must have shorter hours of work; we must not work so hard," and on what foundation of national interest does he rest his case? It seems to me there is colossal misconception somewhere.

Do not forget that we are already hampered by a loss of goodwill. I doubt if the Canadian people can do this task alone. Canada is a young country with vast natural resources upon which we have only made a beginning. We need more development, we need and have always needed more capital, and all the alleged profits and savings in the country will not be

sufficient. We need and have always needed more people. This country can support five times the population that we have to-day. How are we going to secure any of these basic needs if we establish, or try to establish, a false economic condition in our country? Should we not rather say to ourselves: we must get down to a practical working basis—we must meet our needs with the necessary amount of energy to supply those needs. To do otherwise, is not to gain but to lose, and not only to lose, but to suffer in the very proportion that we fail.

Now, it must be clear that these arguments are not made in the interest of employers, but absolutely in the interest of the whole people. There may be every sympathy with the widespread desire to go easy, but the trouble is it cannot be done; we are behind, away behind, with production, and we must first catch up. There may come a time when hours may be shortened and real wages or purchasing power may be much greater than they are to-day, but that time will only be when we have caught up, when we have produced more than there is need for. We will have the choice then of dividing up still more or of cutting down the hours to whatever will maintain a satisfactory balance.

The third thing to consider in regard to hours of labour is whether reduction below the present average of hours per week and the establishment of a standard 8-hour day for all trades is really necessary to secure a standard of health and recreation for the worker. This matter has been very extensively investigated in England and the United States, with the general conclusion that it is impossible to compare many industries with others in the matter of fatigue and the standardization of hours per day or per week. It is true that many industries in both of these countries work 54, 56, 60, and 65 hours per week, and comparative health and output tests have been taken on all sorts of reductions in hours per week; but, with the exception of a few like mining and smelting, no conclusions were made that hours need be reduced below 50 per week on account of the health of the workers. It was found, however, that while to a large extent output did not suffer by reduction in hours where the previous hours were long, such as 54 to 65 hours per week, output did suffer in due proportion when hours were reduced below 50 per week. There may be exceptions where reductions below 50 did not lower output, but the proportion is so small that it is not worth considering.

The Health of Munition Workers Committee of the British Ministry of Munitions, in Memorandum No. 29, October, 1917, on "Weekly Hours of Employment," made the following conclusions as to the proper length of the work-day:

> It is impossible to lay down a single rule as to the best hours in all cases. The best scheme can only be determined after a careful consideration of a number of different factors, such as the character of the strain, whether heavy or light, continuous or intermittent, pace of machine work, factory environment, arrangement of hours and outside conditions. It was found that the time schedule producing the maximum output varied with the character of the operation. For men engaged in very heavy labour, the maximum hours of actual work yielding the most effective results appear to be 56 hours per week; for men engaged in moderately heavy labour, probably 60 hours per week; while for men and youths engaged in light labour such as tending semi-automatic machines, probably 64 hours per week would be the maximum.

I know very well these things are being changed very rapidly in England, but this is the finding of a Committee which was appointed by the Government to look into these things. It has nothing to do with what has happened since. It was based upon an honest investigation of what they actually found in the industries they undertook to investigate.

The National Industrial Conference Board, of Boston, has made extensive studies of various basic industries in the United States during the past two years, including the metal industry, silk manufacture, cotton manufacture, boot and shoe industry, and wool manufacturing. In reference to the metal industry, it concluded that:

1st, a 50-hour week has proved efficient and practicable in a large number of metal manufacturing establishments.

2nd, a 48-hour week has proved practicable in a considerable number of establishments.

There is no clear-cut line below which a reduction in hours brings a practically uniform change in efficiency of production in different establishments.

I go on to quote from the same authority. They conclude:

> Distinction should be made between what can be done and what as a practical matter will be done. Much depends upon the degree of co-operation secured between the management and its workers. If full co-operation to attain the highest reasonable efficiency could be secured there can be little doubt that a 50-hour week could be generally adopted in the metal trades without serious loss of production. Several of the statements given in this report by manufac-

turers who maintained production when hours were shortened refer to such co-operation. Likewise, the evidence indicates that under such conditions a 44-hour week could be made an economic schedule in a much larger proportion of establishments than is now possible. No single factory could do more to accomplish this result than the recognition by workers of the indisputable principle that their real interest and that their real opportunity for bettering their condition lies in increasing the efficiency of individual production. But unless both management and workers actively co-operate to this end, there can be little question that the general adoption of a 48-hour week in the metal trade would involve a serious economic loss to the nation.

Less than 10 per cent of the metal trades industry in the United States work less than 48 hours per week.

In the other industries mentioned no conclusions are drawn in reference to a 48- or 50-hour week, as all those industries work almost entirely on more than 50 hours per week.

We have basic industries in Canada, such as lumber and milling, fishing and agriculture, where the 48-hour day is wholly inapplicable.

There can be very little contention that reduction of hours below 50 per week can have a detrimental effect on the health of the "worker" except in a very few industries. Therefore, what is the great need of compelling every one to limit output to 8 hours per day at this very stressful period of our history?

The fourth thing to consider in regard to hours of labour is where Canada stands with other nations in reference to the Peace Conference suggestions and to the dangers which lie behind the introduction of politics into industry. The National Industrial Conference Board sent a Commission of very able men in the spring of this year to study the industrial conditions in England, France and Italy. I cannot do better than quote from the conclusions of this Commission (Interim Report, paragraphs 20-22):

The most considerable introduction of politics into the industrial question has been, of course, the formation at the Paris Peace Conference of an International Labour Conference which has proposed certain clauses affecting labour to be inserted into the Treaty of Peace.

Without going into a specific discussion of the standard of living or the 8-hour day, it is to be noted that these primary demands of organized labour have thus been given international advertising and that it is intended to bring the pressure of all governments to bear on the adoption by each country of such a measure as an 8-hour day. It is a very adroit means of establishing in the minds of the public who have not closely followed the matter that the 8-hour day is coming anyhow, and hence that a legal enactment might as well be accepted now as well as later.

While it is patent that such a law cannot be applied equally to all industries or to all kinds of workers—and the Paris proposals make provision for some exceptions; yet the insistence of this clause in the Treaty of Peace makes it very difficult to prevent the introduction into kinds of work where it would be wholly inapplicable.

The immediate effect expected to be agitation for the passage of an eight-hour law by the French Corps Legislatif. This Act was passed April 23, 1919, it was a part of the general understanding to say that it was certain steps to be enacted by national legislation in the United States; that it was coming into all countries; and this misunderstanding was used to secure the passage of the French law. It was even asserted that French employers had assented to the enactment. After considerable inquiry we found this not to be an honest statement without a protest. The Minister of Labour had called a Conference of employers and labour leaders to discuss the proposed eight-hour law and pressure had been exerted on the employers. The latter indeed issued a printed protest against the measure, and they also urged that it should not be inserted in the Treaty of Peace. It was declared:

1. That the total production of France before the war was about $5,000,000,000.

2. That nearly 2,000,000 workers, or 5 per cent, had been killed or maimed.

3. That in workers France had but one and one-half times more than Germany; two and one-half times more than Belgium; five times more than England and Italy; fifty-six times more than the United States.

4. Together with the frightful reduction in births, which would continue even to 1919, the diminution of 20 per cent in the hours of labour from ten to eight would cause a reduction in the total production of France of $1,000,000,000, or 20 per cent.

Coming in addition to the systematic destruction in the war, which had not been suffered by its competitors, the uniform and rapid reduction of the labour day to eight hours would, in most branches of national production, according to the protest, be a disastrous influence and would absolutely ruin the exodus of labour from the land to the cities. In many of the French industries the loss of human energies could not be made up by any introduction of machinery. And yet, at this critical time, tiring all strokes of the mental, moral and industrial upheaval, politics were being played with the labour question so that the law was quickly enacted by the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate.

In Italy, politics had already been interwoven with industrial questions. Only a small percentage of labour is organized into unions, but the extreme radicals control them. They are the ones who make spurious threaten, not when striking resort to violence. Thus they frighten the general body of peaceful workers into joining them in any crisis; and they succeed in intimidating the employers. In recent months, of course, the absorbing question in Italy has been her attitude in the proposed terms of peace.

Taking advantage of this extreme situation, the extremists have increased their disorder, and to avoid a general strike while the Peace Congress was in session in Paris, the Government brought great pressure to bear on employers to meet the demands of labour.

As a consequence, not so much because of the demands of organized labour as to meet the demands of politics, the employers have generally accepted the principle of the eight-hour

day. In the metal trades, owing to slack discipline, the old ten-hour day was only equivalent to about nine; so that the change was really only from nine to eight hours. In the textile trades, however, the new Act will be almost certainly disastrous. As compared with the pre-war period, labour costs in the cotton mills at the present time have been trebled. In reeling and throwing silk, costs are now 40 per cent above those of Japan, who has driven Italy out of the American market. In March silk wages were raised 70 per cent; and now the additional payment of ten hours' wages for eight hours' work will be so ruinous that the mills will shut down rather than yield. Although the Government had bought up the silk crop under a valorization scheme, it favoured the eight-hour day.

There is no law in England standardizing the eight-hour day; but limited hours are applied in certain industries and the 48-hour week as a unit it being adopted in many industries.

In the United States it is estimated that less than 30 per cent of all industries work less than 48 hours per week, and there will undoubtedly be the greatest amount of opposition to further reduction. In this connection, it is interesting to note that travellers who have recently returned from Germany state that the German people have settled down to the hard task which confronts them. They have taken off their coats, gritted their teeth, and gone to work. They are prepared to produce, and soldiers are returning to industry as rapidly as possible. The feeling there is that work is the great solvent and that production will save them from serious trouble. There is a feeling in Germany that they will meet the situation just as France met it in 1870, and that in a few years their surplus goods and their control of foreign markets will be such as to make the indemnity comparatively easy. T' is indeed will be the situation if, while Germany is working, the rest of the world is fighting to see how little may be produced. Politicians, business men, and labour leaders, should try and visualize the Germany of five years hence and to realize now that their program of work is their greatest asset. Is it possible to bring this point home to our people, and particularly to the workers, who will be the chief sufferers if depression is forced on the country through the automatic and inexorable working of economic laws in creating an adjustment, which might be brought about by co-operation and increased production.

Why not regulate the hours of labour in those industries the nature of which require regulation in the interests of the health and safety of the workers, but leave employers and employees free to make their own contracts under actual conditions existing in each industry and with regard to domestic and international competition.

The fifth question to consider regarding hours of labour is an exact definition of what the proposed 8-hour day is. That is, whether it is intended to be a straight 8-hour day based entirely on health and welfare of the worker, or whether it is to be a basic 8-hour day, based upon the payment of extra wages after eight hours have been worked. These two kinds of day regulation are very different in character. I beg to quote from the study of the National Industrial Conference Board on the Eight-Hour Day, which seems to cover the subject very thoroughly:

> The eight-hour day in its rigid sense, with prohibition of overtime, is founded on the theory that such limitations of work hours is demanded on grounds of health and social advantages. The contention is also often made that the straight eight-hour day is more productive than a longer workday. With these underlying premises for limitation of hours of work, overtime is inconsistent. Clearly, if the health of the worker or his social rights demand that he shall not work more than eight hours per day, permission of overtime labour, except in extraordinary emergency, is illogical. If the straight eight-hour day is more productive than a longer workday, overtime is absurd.

The basic eight-hour day is essentially a wage issue. Eight hours of work are taken as a convenient standard by which to measure service, any hours in excess of these in a calendar day being paid for as overtime, usually at higher rate, but sometimes on a pro rata basis.

Increased rates for overtime are obviously designed to discourage employers from resorting to it. To this extent, the provision is related to the problem of health and social relaxtion. In practice, however, these penal rates have proved an incentive to overtime by the employee, and thus tend to defeat any desire to promote his health or increase his leisure. Therefore, these rates, though ostensibly a penalty on the employer, are in reality a premium to the employee. So far as such an incentive induces the worker to work a longer day than is justified on the grounds of health, it is clearly warranted only by unusual emergency. In such cases overtime is physically undesirable, and overtime rates mean extra compensation for diminished productivity. Furthermore, experience has shown that the overtime rates tend to increase the amount of absenteeism during regular hours, for which premium overtime rates workers can earn their usual wages in shorter time and are thus more inclined to "lay off."

In principle, the straight 8-hour day is a matter of social policy based on regard for the health, welfare, and leisure of the workers. The basic 8-hour day is a measure of service and reward. The former regulates hours of service, the latter is a form of wage arrangement.

This essential difference is in a measure reflected in the methods by which limitation on work-hours has been brought about. Legislation has been the most general method for the introduction of the 8-hour day. Such legislation has usually been prompted by those who give weight to social considerations, while action by employers or by labour unions has generally favored the basic day. In any event, labour organizations have repeatedly opposed legislative limitation of hours of work on the ground that such legislation would weaken their economic strength. Thus the American Federation of Labour at its Conventions in 1914 and 1915, defeated resolutions favoring the enforcement of a straight 8-hour day by-law. The Adamson Law for railroad employees, providing for a basic 8-hour day, was, on the other hand, forced by the demands of organized labour.

I submit that it is hardly a function of Government to enact a basic 8-hour day if it can be shown to be merely a practical means of increasing wages. I am inclined to believe that organized labour would oppose a straight 8-hour day statute, in spite of the fact that their great and chief argument is on account of health and welfare. It is clearly evident that a wage statute to provide increases of pay over 8 hours would operate very seriously against production and toward increases of costs in many industries, particularly those who would be compelled to reduce from their present basis of nine or ten hours, having to choose between reduction of output of from 10 to 20 per cent, or increase the wages cost to the extent of time and one-half for one or two hours as the case might be. Again, it is clear that production must come first, and is of overwhelmingly greater importance.

The sixth question to consider in regard to hours of labour is, what proportion of our people are behind these proposals for a shorter work day? I understand that the Labour side of this Conference is essentially organized Labour and particularly international organized Labour. Anyway, it seems clear that organized labour is promoting and pressing for this legislation. It is only fair to ask what proportion of the workers of Canada does organized labour represent? In the United States, with a total population of 105,000,000, it is estimated that about 40 per cent, or 41,000,000, are workers, and of these about 8 per cent, or 3,000,000, are members of labour unions. I have no definite estimates for Canada, but on the same basis, with a population of 8,000,000 we should have a total of 3,200,000 workers. According to the Department of Labour there are about 250,000 members of trade unions, which is about 8 per cent of the total, or the same as in the United States.

Granting them to be 10 per cent, I submit that it is only fair to ask that great care be taken to obtain a definite record of the feelings and desires of the great 90 per cent of the workers, and the still greater general public who are not represented here, before any legislative action is taken. And before obtaining this record, I think the Government should carefully test the truth of the facts I have set forth, that it should prepare an authoritative statement of the whole case, and should circularize the entire population of Canada very thoroughly, so that the workers and the general public should have the opportunity to study the facts and judge clearly and intelligently as to the right course to take at this great crisis in our history.

Now let us see what are the motives and ideas which are behind the demands of organized labor for reduction in the hours of labour and the standardization of the work-day over all industry.

It seems to me to be unnecessary to discuss the unrest which exists in Canada as well as in every other country and the reason for its existence, the movements tending toward socialistic government, so-called democratic control of industry, and the threats of and the fear of revolutionary action by the radical element.

Organized labour claims to have no sympathy with radicalism, but it does want more participation and more interest in the conduct of production. It asks what it calls a fairer share in the benefits of production or a more equal distribution of profits, in other words, it wants to raise the standard of living. Granting that these things are reasonable, and also that the employers realize that a new era of national co-operation for national welfare, greater prosperity for all classes of people, all workers, whether organized or not, are necessary to the solution of our present fundamental national problem. Then the great question is how to accomplish all this or how to get properly started on our way without losing ground, without losing

sight of the absolutely vital needs of the nation for greater production to meet its tremendously increased obligations.

It seems to me that organized labour has, in its efforts to secure consideration, developed some practices which are economically bad. One of its greatest fears has been and is that of unemployment. Wherever labour has organized it has tried to restrict, and succeeded in restricting, production. It seems possessed of the idea that employment is an exhaustible commodity and that by lessening the production per worker, both by limiting the effort and shortening the hours, it must spread the work out over more workers. Whoever is to blame for the fact, the average employee does not understand his true position in reference to total output. He does not connect himself with, but stands opposed to, the interests of management and capital, which are just as necessary to the national welfare and production as he is. He puts his own wants forward in the belief that there is somewhere an inexhaustible supply of wages which can be drawn upon to obtain his wants if he can only enforce his demands. He does not know that wages really come out of the flow of products and other factors remaining constant. The distribution of wages cannot be widened except by an increase of the flow. I contend that this belief of labour is a complete fallacy and is responsible for more suspicion and distrust, more increase in the cost of everything, more business depression than any other element in the industrial problem.

I cannot help feeling that organized labour in Canada and the United States has another motive in securing an 8-hour day, and I am convinced it is a basic 8-hour day and not a straight 8-hour day it seeks; that is, the increase of pay which comes through overtime. It can readily be seen that, if wages are based on the relationship of an 8-hour day to the cost of living, a condition where overtime became necessary or customary—and I am pretty sure the workers have always welcomed overtime—the extra wages would greatly augment the earnings of the workers receiving them. During the war, overtime was the rule all over America, and large sums were paid out in excess of the regular pay. It is well known that in some United States Government plants when, after the stress was off and the hours of labour were cut to eight per day and no overtime was forthcoming, the men actually went on strike to compel its reinstatement. The chief objection from an economic standpoint to carrying on industry under such conditions was the great increase in costs involved. This amounted to much more than the actual overtime paid, because it developed a great deal of time-taking during regular hours which was made up in overtime. Now, suppose in Canada we do succeed in getting down to work and look our national needs square in the face, showing plainly, as I have stated, the urgent need of greater production than we have ever made before, how long will it take to use up our very limited and more or less depleted supply of workers? Suppose, for argument, that we have passed legislation to restrict the hours of labour either to a straight 8-hour day or to a basic 8-hour day. What are we up against? In the case of the straight 8-hour day we have blocked the way to increased production by a measure supposed to have been passed in the interests of health and leisure, which becomes directly opposed to the only immediate means of obtaining the necessary real wages and the material welfare of the whole people.

In the case of the basic 8-hour day we can waive the health and leisure interest, and can increase production, though not in the proportion of the hours worked; but we create an immediate rise in the cost of production which might have a serious effect on all foreign business. It would undoubtedly have a definite effect on the cost of living, and tend to put it in the power of foreign competitors to invade our markets. It is only fair to say that the demand for shorter hours than are at present worked, from a desire for more leisure, may be quite justifiable under certain conditions; but these conditions involve sufficient production, which is the very heart and centre of the prosperity and welfare of the whole people of Canada.

On behalf of the employers of Canada, I ask a consideration of this analysis of the question of hours of labour, as made in the interests of all industry, all the people of Canada, and most of all the workers themselves. The employers are keenly alive to the very disturbed conditions; they are very willing to meet all questions fairly and honestly and to try to do what is best in the interests of all concerned. They frankly admit there are faults on their side which should be corrected. At the same time, they cannot see that giving way to things they know to be wrong can do any good. This is the time to discover the errors and to get on the track of the genuinely right way. If they oppose

any suggestions or efforts which are made at this Conference, it is because they do not believe them to be wise at this time or in the interests of the whole people.

The reasons I have set forth against further reduction in hours of labour are not now; the same conditions exist in other countries and the same arguments are being used. The workers everywhere are said not to believe them. It cannot be denied that great efforts have been made to keep them from believing them. But believing things are not true does not make them untrue. If they are true the workers must believe them before we can go very far on the road to genuine national welfare. The standard of living of the people depends upon real wages, and real wages depend upon the per capita production. Canada's production and the whole world's production is away below requirements.

Col. DAVID CARNEGIE (London, England): Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen: I had no intention of taking part in this discussion to-day; but as a result of what has been said, I am impressed with my own experience—an experience which I am sure is common to most of the delegates on both sides of this House. I think there are advantages and disadvantages in having shorter hours for the worker; but the problems are human and economic. What are the human problems? I can remember when my father advised me to continue my education, and I told him I was sick of school and was anxious to get into work. He said, "All right, my boy, go to it;" and at the age of fourteen I got up at five o'clock in the morning and trudged down to work for five years, serving my apprenticeship to engineering under conditions which were difficult, I am sure, to me; But when I remember how many a sick man came to the shop and told us how his family was suffering at home, and how he had spent two or three hours during the night looking after the youngsters, my sympathies began to be stirred, and I wondered whether, after all, even in those days when the monotony was not as it is to-day, some change could be effected. I can remember that the inspiration of life came to me when I started working, and, instead of the desire to continue manual labour, immediately I touched the material things the mental activities began to operate, and science work was at once taken on in evening classes. Many a day I started at five o'clock in the morning and finished at twelve at night. That is a common experience of all of us, and you say, "But you survived it well, didn't you?" I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that if we are to set out in life to enter for those who by nature or by grace have gifts that will make them outstanding from their fellows in any characteristics whatever, we have to adjust our minds to some other considerations; we have to think over those; and we have to think also of those men having handicaps who have been dumped into the world instead of born. We have to consider that the human problem to-day is one that, as employers or as employed, we cannot ignore.

I said a moment ago that the conditions thirty-five years ago when I set out were different from what they are to-day. Automatic machinery was practically unknown; we had a variety of work—the fitting, the turning, the pattern-making, the men in the office,—and all those varieties of interests that made for a fresh and happy condition of mind that inspired the worker. What have you to-day? Why, you have a drudgery in many employments that is made exacting because of the conditions; you have a condition of affairs into which we have been thrown by reason of the great desire for increased production.

Now let me turn, if I may, to the economic side. As I said, I have worked in the shops under the 9½ and 10 hours a day system; but I have had the pleasure and the opportunity of comparing the difference between the 8-hour day and the old 10 and 9½-hour day; and I think I have facts to prove that the difference created by extra hours of leisure had such an effect upon the physical condition in reducing physical fatigue that under the 9½ and the 10-hour day the production was no more than the production under the 8-hour day.

I know that Lloyd George in his speech on British policy on the 18th August last stated that for twenty or thirty years he had been in the British House of Commons advocating an 8-hour day. He said that it had been often stated in that House that no difference was possible—or shall I put it this way, that under the 8-hour day, a result was obtained equivalent—to that under the longer day; but he said his information was just the reverse. Let me tell you my own experience in this matter. Sir Robert Hadfield, whose name has been already mentioned this morning, twenty-three or twenty-four years ago introduced the 8-hour day. I had the honour of managing his works during the first four or five years of this

century, and I was able to make statistical comparisons of the work done during those years—the shorter hours with the previous long hours day—and I can say and I have this verified by Sir Robert himself—that the absolute economic results were equal if not more than the results obtained from the longer day. Just before coming here I saw Sir Robert, and I said to him: "Now, tell me, Sir Robert, can you recommend a 44-hour week? You know as well as I do that during the time we were operating we made something around the region of 25 per cent dividend on the profits of production; do you anticipate that if a 44-hour week is introduced there is any real hope that there would be equivalent effort put into the shorter hours to make up for the reduction?" He replied that he was not in a position to make any definite assertion on that point, but he could only judge from the experience he had had, and he gave me this: "Dire disaster was predicted for my firm in breaking away and going against all the then-known economic laws; happily not one of the predictions came true." His firm was in a position twenty-three years ago that many firms are in to-day in Canada and all over the world.

Now, let me say another thing. We have in Canada a condition that does not exist in England; we have racial facts; we have provincial laws regulating hours of labour because of the conditions differentiating one province from another. These facts are so important in the consideration of the reduction of hours that any experience that one may have had in England on the shorter hours day cannot be just fitted into Canadian experience. But I do say this, that if any shortening of the hours in any industry is considered advisable by this Conference, some evidence should be given from labour that national conditions must be also considered, so that we will have in return a corresponding increase of energy. From the human standpoint I believe that it is possible to get more work in the shorter day than in the longer day except when we go beyond a certain point where physical exhaustion tells. As has been so ably pointed out by Mr. White, we have a situation not only in Canada but all over the world which demands serious consideration if actual production in the country is to be saved from decline. We have, for instance, conditions in India to-day—what are they? We have a mat industry in England which is struggling to maintain competition with coolie labour in India which is almost overpowering. I have sat at conferences of employers and employees of the industry. I have seen the serious men on both sides, workers and employers, discussing this matter, both of them feeling that it was their own business. It was not a question whether the labourer or the employer should be defeated on a proposition from one side or the other. They had the question seriously before them: how are we going to overcome the competition which is brought about by longer hours of labour and cheaper labour in India in the production of mats imported into England against the mats produced in England? The same position, in some measure, exists in Canada in relation to many products, and I think it is well that this subject should not be passed over lightly, but be fully considered.

Mr. M. P. WHITE: If I may, I would just like to quote a statement of the Premier of Great Britain, made before the House of Commons, which is very significant when you consider it in its true light, because, as Colonel Carnegie said, he has been an advocate of the 8-hour day.

Mr. FRED WELSH: I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN: According to the rules of procedure, the gentleman who introduces a subject may reply at the close of the debate. If you will kindly comply with the regulations, I think the result will be better order.

May the Chairman make a statement? There may be some present who are not clear as to the fact that Colonel Carnegie has been for a year past a member of the Labour Sub-Committee which has been advising the Cabinet on various matters here, and therefore he is a delegate here by virtue of being a member of that Committee, in addition to his being a visitor, in the capacity in which he spoke yesterday. I just wanted to make that clear so that all might understand it.

Miss HELENA GUTTERIDGE (Vancouver): Mr. Chairman, ten minutes is a very, very little time in which to take up a few of the points raised by Mr. White; but nevertheless I must take some of that ten minutes in trying to counteract the very, very pessimistic note which ran through his whole discourse. I think it would be as well for the delegates at this Conference to bring forward again in their minds the fact that this Conference was called hopefully; the hope being that we could arrive

at a common basis, at a solution, or bring forward some means of allaying the unrest which is so apparent throughout the country. The points touched upon by Mr. White were so numerous that I am only going to attempt to cover one or two.

With regard to the question of the 8-hour day, I think it should be borne in mind by this Conference that in putting forward a plea for an 8-hour day and a 44-hour week labour is not putting forward its ideal.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Hear, hear.

Miss GUTTERIDGE: It is putting forward a compromise. We are endeavouring to fix a compromise between what we consider is an ideal working day and the working day which the average employer of labour thinks is absolutely necessary for sufficient production to feed, clothe and shelter the people of Canada, and also to meet the expenses of the war. Mr. White emphasized the fact that there was a great responsibility on the people of Canada in regard to the payment of the debt incurred through the war. I think, in fact I know, that the workers of the Dominion of Canada, all over Canada, fully realize their responsibility, inasmuch as it was a majority of the workers who laid down their lives, and it was the workers who produced the weapons for the destruction of the enemy, and also produced the foodstuffs for the support of the armies in the field, without which the war could not have been carried on. The workers fully realize that, and they also fully realize that the war debt will have to be paid out of the production of the worker. There is no wealth except it be produced by the application of labour to the natural resources of any country in the world. There is no other wealth in existence. The workers, realizing that, and also knowing fully that their productive efforts are unalleviated, through working long hours, are pressing eagerly for a shorter hour day to enable them to recover from the fatigue of the production, and sometimes the fearful speeding-up to which they are subject to-day, which makes it necessary that they should not be worked every hour of the day and half of the night. They find that at least the very maximum working day should be 8 hours. I have read the report of the Ministry of Munitions in the old country dealing with the question of the 8-hour day, and particularly I read it in connection with the working day for women; and I noted specially that in one instance there was found to be a falling off in the output of the women workers in making munitions, and investigation revealed the fact that because of the hours they were working they did not recover sufficiently from the fatigue day after day, until there was such an accumulation of fatigue at the end of the week that they did not properly recover at the week-end. It was found that to continue the labour of women for a longer period than 8 hours a day—and the same think applies to men—was like stretching a piece of elastic a little too far: it did not go back as it was originally, because the elasticity was lost, and therefore the production was lowered. It was found that with the institution of a shorter working day greater production resulted. Coming as I do from what we consider the more progressive West, I am astonished that there should even be any discussion on the enactment of legislation for an 8-hour day. An 8-hour day and a 44-hour week is a matter of custom out West in practically all the industries; and, although I admit that the industries are very small compared with some industries in the East, and the same class of industry as carried on in other countries, I do not see these western industries going out of business. Neither do I see any signs that the production of the workers during these eight hours a day, or the four hours on Saturday, is any less than the production of the workers in the part of the country where they are working ten and sometimes twelve hours a day. I do not yet see any signs of bankruptcy in industries where both men and women are working eight hours a day and forty-eight hours a week. The reason that the labour movement is advocating a forty-eight hour week at the present time, as I told you right at the beginning, is that it is in the nature of a compromise. In this older portion of Canada you have become accustomed to older customs and older traditions, and it is a little more difficult to overcome old customs and old traditions than it is to institute customs in a newer country. Therefore we must overcome that difficulty before advocating a more ideal working day from the workers' point of view, and with a view to meeting with the co-operation of employers of labour. The labour representatives are here in the sincere hope of solving some of the many problems which are pressing at the present moment. We think that the institution of an eight-hour working day will be one step at least, providing the employing interests are willing to meet us in a spirit of co-opera-

tion in the establishing of that eight-hour day.

There are a number of points I would like to cover, but I think I have taken up all of my time.

Some DELEGATES: Go ahead.

MISS HELENA GUTTERIDGE: Now, there is one point, as to which I did not get the exact figures quoted by Mr. White, in regard to the actual monetary value of production in certain given years; but I did hear him make this statement, that the introduction of an eight-hour day would decrease production twelve per cent, and therefore the money value of the production would be decreased to that extent. But I would point out to him that he was quoting figures for 1917 and we are now in 1919. In 1917 we had an army in the field, who had to be supported. The workers were producing everything for the support of that army and were in addition to that producing munitions, which are not now being produced. That labour which was applied to the manufacture of munitions can now be placed in lines of more necessary production. You have also to take into consideration that a great deal of the foodstuffs produced during the war period were destroyed and not used. We have not that condition now to meet. The production necessary for the support of the people is not so great as it was during the war. Therefore your 12 per cent decrease in production by the decrease in the hours of labour, should be, and is, I have no doubt, more than made up in the year 1919 by the number of people taken from the manufacture of weapons of war and employed in production which is more necessary, and also by the great number of men who were engaged in the war and who have now returned to civil life and are employed in producing. They have certainly lived through the period of the war and the workers produced all the foodstuffs necessary at that time. Apart from supplying the huge army of men actually fighting, the workers supplied the labour engaged in the production of foods for their keep and in the manufacture of weapons of destruction. If all those men are coming back and are not placed in industry, you will have a problem of unemployment on your hands to be solved, just as we had a problem of unemployment before the war, in the years 1913, 1914 and part of 1915. If you are not going to have that problem of unemployment to solve, then it becomes absolutely essential to reduce the hours of labour in order to absorb a number of those people who will be out of employment when all of them have returned from overseas.

Now, from the point of view of health. The only real asset any country has is productive citizenship, and the citizens are the workers. We are hearing a great deal about the necessity for increased production. If you have workers who are not healthy, who are over-fatigued, then your production is certainly going down—it is not going to increase. Not from the point of view of sentiment at all, but from the point of view of sheer common-sense, it pays to have healthy workers, because if workers are healthy and happy they will produce a great deal more than if they are in a constant state of irritation and ill-health; for a man who is sick cannot produce, any more than a woman who is sick can produce. Neither can a worker produce who is constantly irritated, knowing that in one part of the country his fellow-workers are working eight hours a day, while in another part of the country he is working twelve hours. If he is constantly irritated, the condition of unrest will not be alleviated to any great extent until you arrive at some system of co-ordinating the hours of labour worked in the various provinces of Canada, and at some basis whereby all the workers will be working a legitimate number of hours. I thank you for your attention.

Hon. E. J. DAVIS (Newmarket, Ont.): Mr. Chairman, I am very glad indeed to have the privilege of attending as an elected delegate this most unique and what I hope will be most useful gathering of citizens of Canada. Before I take up three or four minutes with the subject under discussion I would like to express the principles on which I wish to talk during this Convention. I have been in public life a good many years and I think I am noted for not speaking frequently, and therefore I would like to lay down the principle on which I expect any little discussion in which I may engage will be based.

This is a unique and historic gathering, the first of the kind ever called together in the Dominion of Canada. One unique feature in connection with this gathering is that we have lady delegates taking part in the proceedings of this Convention—the first time, I believe, in the history of Canada that such an event has taken place. They will have the pleasure in the years

to come, of saying that they attended the first gathering of this kind in our great Dominion.

I was delighted to hear in the speeches yesterday the principles which were laid down by some of our eminent men. Take for instance the Prime Minister of Canada, who has taken a great deal of interest in connection with this whole matter. He told us in his address, which was read to us, that there are three foundation principles which he wishes to operate in any course of action that may be taken by his Government in connection with labour and with other matters. His first principle is justice. That is the foundation principle of everything that is good in this world—justice. The next, he says, is confidence. If we do not have confidence in each other we never can succeed anywhere. All the business of the country is done on the basis of confidence, and when you have no confidence in the man with whom you deal you cannot succeed in accomplishing anything at all. The next is co-operation. That is another principle which is of the utmost importance, and I trust that the delegates at this meeting from almost all the interests of Canada will become acquainted and that we shall better understand each other and each other's views, and aims and aspirations, and that the result will be that we shall go away from this Convention to the various parts of this Dominion with such an inspiration and an understanding for united work as citizens of Canada as we have never had in the past.

We had here yesterday the representative of the Locomotive Engineers of the United States, the great Republic to the south, and he told us that if we were only able to speak of each other in the term "brother," we should have accomplished a great deal. Now there is one principle which would accomplish that, and that is the Golden Rule, which is the foundation of the book to which we look, most of us, for the great principles which ought to guide us in life. Look at the question from the other man's standpoint if you can. "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you". And this is the principle on which we must work, in connection with the objects of this gathering, if we intend to have that success to which we are entitled.

The workers that I have are not called employees; we call them co-workers, and I should like to be permitted to use that expression in speaking of the ladies and gentlemen who are advocating views which sometimes we do not agree with, as we advocate views with which sometimes they may not agree. If we called them co-workers, I think we would be striking the key-note and taking the proper view in discussing all these questions.

We heard Colonel Carnegie state that he began to learn a trade at 14 years of age. In order that you may understand that at least I ought to—and I think I do—sympathize with the man who works hard physically, I may tell you that while I did not quite catch up with Colonel Carnegie, I began at the age of 16 to learn a trade—a hard trade and in many ways a dirty trade. There was no machinery in those days and I worked, not for eight or nine or ten hours, but all my life anywhere from nine to ten, twelve and fifteen hours a day, in order to try to accomplish something, not for my own advantage particularly, because all a manufacturer gets—no matter what industry he may be in or how large an establishment he may have—all he gets is his living. That is all there is to it. The anxieties, the difficulties and the troubles that the manufacturers have gone through for the last three or four years, none but themselves understand fully. And if you take the old men in the manufacturing and other lines of business to-day, you will find that they nearly all began as poor boys, with not half the opportunities that the young men of to-day have. There never was a time in the history of this country, in my judgment, when there were greater opportunities for young men by hard work and industry and enterprise to achieve in a few years distinct success in almost any career they desire to enter upon.

In dealing with this question I am going to say a little something on a different aspect of it, and it is this. There is a proper time to do anything, and there is an improper time, and my point with reference to the hours of labour and to legislation founded thereon, or anything that may be done here, is that this is the improper time to pass any further legislation in connection with labour matters. You say, "That is a pretty startling statement". Well, listen, and I will try to show you why, as it appears to me. I may be mistaken.

First of all, we are not to-day, and we have not been for the last three or four years, running business under normal conditions at all. During these years there have been wonderful advances—our co-workers on the other side, I am sure, will endorse what I say—there have been wonderful advances

in their interests. In the matter of wages, there has been one increase after another, after another, after another. There has been a shortening of hours. Many hundreds of manufacturers voluntarily shortened the hours of their workmen; they did not wait to be asked. There were some cases where you had to strike before they finally did do it, and perhaps some cases where they did not do it even when you did strike. But there has been a wonderful forward march in the last three or four years. I am subject to correction, but in my judgment you have achieved greater results in that period than you did during the previous fifteen or twenty years. That is one thing. The next thing is this: We are not living under normal conditions at all. Is it wise to pass legislation to-day, in our balloon situation, as I like to call it, when we are all complaining about the high cost of living? We are all taking great risks because of that high cost of living. Materials are high, and if there is a drop, in the large manufacturing institutions, there will be immense losses. That possibility must not be lost sight of, and our co-workers on the other side must remember it and think about it, because they are vitally interested in that, as well as the manufacturers themselves. Now, if we pass legislation which may seem proper to-day, when we are living in a hotbed and are not "down to brass tacks," as the boys say, so far as business conditions are concerned, we may in two or three years from now experience a severe depression. I think there is no doubt at all we are heading for a depression in business. It is in the course of events, and it cannot be avoided. I hope it will come gradually, so that it will not be so serious. But if we pass legislation now, the situation may become so serious by and by that we shall, all of us, regret that legislation was placed upon the Statute Book.

There is another point. We have the Peace Treaty, and included in that are certain labour matters, in which the Prime Minister of the Dominion and some of his colleagues took great interest. And what do we find? Those features have been approved by the nations that have accepted the Treaty. All the nations have not accepted it yet, but, supposing they all do—which we hope they will—what then? Canada is just a small country as to population and wealth, as compared with Great Britain, France and the United States. Have we any right to take the risk, before knowing what these other countries are going to do in the way of legislation with reference to labour matters? Are we going to place labour legislation on our statute books without knowing what those countries are going to do? If we cannot export, as has already been said, it will be a very serious thing for this country; and in order to export we must not be handicapped by legislation or in any other manner in our efforts to compete successfully for foreign trade. We are getting demands now, simply because the world is bare of supplies, but those demands will not last always—they will come to an end, and we shall have to get down to a narrow, narrow margin.

My judgment on this whole question of hours of labour is that, as such wonderful advances have been made during the last three or four years in this direction, we would be wise as a nation, and our legislators would do the right thing, to let this matter rest for a year or two, or until we know exactly what the other nations of the world are going to do, and then step into the stride, when the example has been set by others who are stronger and better able to lead the way.

Hon. Mr. Robertson left the Chair, his place being taken by Mr. C. A. Magrath.

Hon. G. D. ROBERTSON: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: If you will bear with me for just a few moments, I would like to give the Convention, not arguments on one side or the other, of this question, but some information regarding the existing situation. Two of the speakers mentioned that information was desirable. Almost immediately after the Royal Commission made its report, in June last—I think, within three days of the time—the Department of Labour decided to gather such information as was possible prior to the holding of this Conference, which was then decided upon. It was considered that it might be useful, in enabling the Conference to arrive at their conclusions, to know what was the existing situation concerning this and one or two other subjects.

In June of 1919 the Wages and Hours Section of the Department of Labour began an inquiry into the prevailing hours of labour in Canada, in view of possible legislation on the subject by all the Allied Governments, parties to the League of Nations. Questionaires were sent to approximately 8,500 firms in Canada, and approximately 6,250 replies were received. These returns cover about 615,000 employees. That is to say, the 6,250 firms in Canada who replied to the questionaires sent out by the Department, or at least whose replies were received, employed about 615,000 persons,

and this number is about 50 per cent, or a little more, of the actual number of persons engaged in industry in Canada. It may perhaps be of interest to you to know that about 1,000 work less than seven hours per day; that 8,088, or 1¼ per cent of the total worked 7 hours per day; that 7,818 worked 7½ hours a day; that 266,226 men and women, or 43.4 per cent of the total, worked an 8-hour day; that 33,267 worked 8½ hours a day; and that 182,729 worked 9 hours a day. Those working 10 hours a day number 120,727, or 19.7 per cent of the whole; and those working 10 hours or upwards number approximately 11,000. So it is almost entirely true to say that there is a very limited number, indeed less than 1½ per cent of our workmen, who to-day work more than 10 hours a day. 43.4 per cent work eight hours; about 3 or 3½ per cent work less than eight hours; which would make a total of about 47 per cent who work eight hours or less.

The Department felt that in arriving at a conclusion information of this sort would be interesting and useful to you. The information has furthermore been tabulated by industries and by provinces, and by industries in individual provinces, so that in the event of it being decided by this Conference to refer this subject to a Committee that has already been designated, I should be glad to place this information at their disposal. The Committee would be able to ascertain by reference to these documents the exact proportion in every industry in every province, and the extent of the hours of labour now worked.

Mr. JOHN A. FLETT (Hamilton): Mr. Chairman and fellow representatives: I am somewhat in accord with my friend Miss Gutteridge in her summing up of the statements made by the gentleman from Toronto, Mr. White. I think it was perhaps the most dismal blue-ruin essay I have ever had the pleasure or displeasure of listening to. I cannot help but be amused at the dire predictions of what is going to befall our land. I was somewhat amused by the statement made by my friend from Newmarket, Mr. Davis, who I understand is a tanner, to the effect that there is a proper time and an improper time for introducing labour legislation. I should like him to tell me when is the proper time. We on this side of the house have never yet discovered it. There never was a time, even the most prosperous in my recollection in this country, when we were not opposed when we sought legislation in the interests of the producers of our country. We have opposition from the gentlemen sitting opposite me on different occasions. I hardly think that they can complain of legislation that has been introduced on behalf of the labour of this country during the last six or seven years. If you will search the records of this country for legislation in the interests of labour, I think you will find mighty meagre traces of it.

We are more concerned about the human factor in production than we are about statistics and figures and predictions and prophecies as to what is going to happen. In the industry that I belong to, we have without legislation secured and established the eight-hour day, and in many instances less than an eight-hour day. I have not seen any industry ruined. I have not seen the workmen leaving this country because of the shorter work-day here.

Something has been said, I think by Mr. Davis, about competition, and what we have to compete with. I heard from some of the eminent gentlemen who addressed us at the beginning of the Conference how one man had lost his reputation in Paris because of his strong language—I presume, in connection with defending the rights of Canada and putting her people on a status with the gentlemen populations of Liberia, or some other place where the negroes abound. We also heard the representative of the Liberal party saying that we were on all fours as far as our desires for that legislation were concerned, no matter who had the authorship of it.

I understand that we have the premiers of the different provinces with us, and I think without exception they have agreed to introduce the eight-hour day. We have some doubt, however, about the attitude of the Premier of Canada who has been contending to place us on an equality, at least, or above the negro. He has some doubt about the introduction of an eight-hour day, and I think he passed that on to my friend Hearst of the province from which I come, and just as promptly Hearst passed back the buck to the Premier, and said, "Go to it, old boy; you have the right." It is quite amusing to us.

If Canada must always be kept behind say the negroes of Liberia and the denizens of Central Africa in order to maintain competition in foreign markets, then we will not depend upon legislation at all, but will go out and get that other 53 per cent by our economic force and power.

Something has been said about how Germany is building up, how that country is to-day a menace industrially, economical-

ly, and commercially to Canada. There are no fighters in the world that are superior or equal to our Canadians; there are no workers in the world that are the equal of the workmen of our country. We can compete with any class of toilers in the world, but we hate to see our civilization and our standards reduced in order to compete with Chinamen or anybody else. We have heard a great deal said about the menace of Germany, and here we are, a victorious country with the latest improved labour-saving machinery capable of producing more in one day than was thought possible in our ancestors' time or when our friend Davis was working the long fifteen hours a day at the dirty job. We have machinery to-day, and the war has demonstrated that when necessity arises we can meet emergencies as we did in Canada and throughout the allied countries of the world. But what are the facts? Even defeated Germany, that country that has to pay an indemnity to the rest of the civilized world, has no fear of the dire calamity that is going to overtake her, and has already declared for an eight-hour day, in spite of the tremendous indemnity which it has to pay. Yet are we in Canada, after licking the Germans, afraid of them economically, industrially, politically, or any other way? I say no, that we on this side of the House are not, and we will pit our labour against theirs any time.

In answer to my friend, I want to cite a case; I want to speak of perhaps the largest single employer of labour in America. I do not know of an employer in Canada who employs as many men, nor do I know of half-a-dozen who employ as many men as the gentleman I am about to speak of. You have heard a great deal about Henry Ford, haven't you? Well, you may be amused at some of the antics of Henry; you may be amused at his idiosyncrasies, and all that sort of thing; you may have your opinion as to whether or not he ought to be examined by a commission; but let me tell you, Henry is no fool, Henry quite understands how to get ahead of competitors in business; and Henry, after the failure of his peace endeavour, after going on the peace ship to Europe with the folk he had picked up en route, decided that he had better get down to business and beat out his competitors instead of trying to put an end to the world war. Henry had a dream, but it was not a nightmare like that of our friend on the other side. Henry had a vision; he had a dream; he said, "To get ahead of my competitors in business, I have to get greater production." That is the same as our friends over there: they are all dying for greater production. Henry said, "There is only one proper, sensible and reasonable way to get greater production, and that is by reducing the hours of labour." and Henry went in and reduced the hours of labour to eight hours a day, and got a larger production out of the eight hours than he had previously got out of ten. Henry has decided that he will go in for still greater production, and he has declared for a seven-hour day, and $7 a day to get it with.

We have such men as Lever, who is to-day working his plant with two shifts of six hours each; he has reduced his overhead charges, and as a result is now one of the greatest manufacturers in the world.

I would say here, so far as the recognition of the eight-hour day is concerned, the Peace Conference said that there could be no lasting peace unless the problem of labour was adjusted satisfactorily, and they have declared that in order to do this there should be an eight-hour day; and they have also declared in favour of the principle that our womanhood should be protected in order that we may produce men fit to go to battle if necessary, instead of having so many rejects from the army, such as we have here and in the United States. Because of the long hours of labour and the deterioration of our womanhood, we have puny men. Then the United States declared that on public works an eight-hour day must prevail. Had the Government of this country decided that an eight-hour day should be the standard and should be applicable to all public works and all federal works, there would be no question of passing the buck from one premier to another; there would be no necessity of rushing machine guns to the Welland canal in order that the eight-hour day might be observed. If you want a contented people, give us a rational, reasonable work-day. Henry Ford employs somewhere in the neighbourhood of 25,000 or 26,000 men, and Henry Ford has got production.

In reply to one gentleman who spoke about the retail trade this morning, I want to refer to the T. Eaton Company. That company is one of the most successful concerns in America, and it has not only adopted an eight-hour day, but has adopted the five-day week proposition; and will

you accuse them of not being a success? They practically started from a shoestring, and look what they have now.

Mr. G. M. McGREGOR (Ford, Ont.): Ladies and gentlemen, I am not holding any brief for Mr. Henry Ford, but I want to refer to some remarks which have been made by the speaker who has just preceded me. I am not attempting to take any advantage of the occasion for advertising purposes, because our company does not need it.

Mr. Moore in his speech the other day said that we were lions and lambs; I think he might more properly have said that we were sheep and goats, the sheep on the right and the goats on the left, the goats being probably better for milking purposes.

Some of the speakers who have preceded me have referred to a panacea. A panacea to the minds of some men is the eight-hour day and a large enough minimum wage. Speaking for our company, and the company in Detroit, I wish to correct some of the statements of the previous speaker. He referred to 26,000 employees in the United States, whereas there are 56,000. We have over 4,300 in Canada alone. The minimum is not $7 a day, but $6 a day, paid by both companies. In the United States there is an eight-hour day, but in Canada there is an 8½-hour day, a 48-hour week, with a minimum wage of 75 cents per hour. Some of these statements have been spread broadcast over the country. I am not here to say what you should or should not do, but I think that the Government should be careful that these statements should not be used in connection with other businesses.

While I have a certain interest in our company, the conditions of that company are such that it can afford to split its profits with its employees in that way; but I am also a director in other companies in which it is not possible to handle our employees in any similar manner to what we do in the Ford Company. In considering this question of an 8-hour day I think it should be considered as so many hours a week instead of by the day. Our basis is 48 hours per week. Notwithstanding all these reports about wages paid by the Ford Company, etc., I would like you to understand that we have not yet reached that stage to which we looked forward, because if you go into the United States you will find wagons running up and down the streets carrying newspapers that call Mr. Ford everything that they can afford to call him because he is not splitting his profits further with his employees. We are trying to get a satisfactory solution of the question of the working day and the working wage, but notwithstanding all that is done in our industry we cannot satisfy them. Then, how are we going to get legislation here? Even in Australia, where labour has almost everything it wants in the way of legislation, have you a satisfactory solution of the difficulty there? You have continuous strikes. I was there in 1907, and it seems to me that every year since then the industries are tied up for months and months at a time. Only recently there was a big strike in the shipbuilding industry which tied up the country for months. In face of the fact that we have the problems of the minimum wage and of working hours, I merely say that we should proceed carefully and cautiously in this matter, and I hope that if we do so we will arrive at some solution that has been referred to as a panacea by many of the preceding speakers.

Mr. E. S. WOODWARD (Victoria): I want very briefly to refer to the remarks made this morning by Mr. Ashdown regarding the effect of a shorter work-day in the retail trade. We have had experience in Victoria, fortunately a fairly satisfactory experience, in regard to the attempt to get a shorter retail day than in the past. We have experimented with the weekly half-holiday and the elimination of night shopping, and we have found that employers as a whole agree with us that a shorter work-day is desirable. In fact, during the recent campaign that we conducted to procure some of these conditions, I was in charge of the campaign, and our finances were supplied by the employing interests, who themselves desired to shorten the day. The whole obstruction comes from the few narrow and short-sighted men who have not a very large conception of business or anything else, and it is to bring along those who withstand progress that legislation is desirable. If it were left with the merchants and clerks of Victoria to solve these problems by a 75 per cent. vote on each side, say, there would be no difficulty in instituting in the retail trade the desired reform, including the weekly half-holiday on Saturday.

There is one reply I wish to make to Mr. White. I do not wish to cover his general material; it was too detailed to do so without taking very elaborate notes but I do

want to say that, as I gathered the burden of his argument, it was this: that the reform of labour issues must wait until every last cent of the exactions of privileges shall have been paid; that until the interest, for instance, on the Victory bonds, and the interest on privilege in all its forms has been paid, there shall be no concession in regard to the reduction of hours or improvement of conditions so far as the great mass of workers are concerned. I want to say for myself—and I certainly speak for thousands in Western Canada, though I do not know whether I speak for those around me to-day that unless financial privilege, land privilege, and all the great monopolies of this country are prepared to make concessions so as to put human welfare first; until first of all the needs of the worker with his wife and his children, their daily needs, are satisfied—unless that comes first we shall not make very much progress in improved industrial relations.

First of all, there must come improvement in the conditions of labour. I have a suspicion that the high cost of living and the great unrest that we are facing are intimately related to the recent flotation of Victory bonds. I have a suspicion that the enormous interest which is being paid is a charge on the production of this country which will make us head for ruin; and I would ask you ladies and gentlemen here this morning to give heed to the words of Sir George Paish, no mean authority, a man frequently consulted by the British Government, to this effect: "Just as we conscripted human life during the war for national needs, the time has come when we shall wipe out this great debt by conscripting wealth." Now, unless privilege in this country is prepared to face these conditions, to remember that we cannot eternally borrow to meet current needs, unless they are prepared to meet the worker half way in these things, we are very little ahead in the way of improved industrial relations.

My whole influence in Western Canada, as my record will prove, has been to restrain those who are seeking direct action. My whole influence has been to restrain those who would upset the constitution of the country by short-cuts in order to solve their problems. But I would warn ladies and gentlemen that deep below our industrial unrest there are economic problems, and unless we deal with the economic causes of poverty and low wages that we are facing, we shall make little or no progress. Until privilege gets out of this land, until every man and woman born feels that Canada is for the Canadians, until we inherit our rights as a people, we shall make no progress. So I ask that we shall not burke the facts; and I say this, that the Victory Loan has placed upon the people an annual burden that has to be paid; that the Victory Loan has cast an awful burden upon the poor; that the non-bondholders are charged with paying the principal and interest to those who lent the money, while those who lent the money are tax-free. I say that while you have such conditions, while we have men who will conscript life to fight the nation's battles, but hesitate to cons- the nation's battles, but hesitate to conscript wealth, we shall make very little progress indeed.

Mr. E. M. TROWERN (Ottawa): Mr. Chairman, members of the Dominion and Provincial Governments, Ladies and Gentlemen, the question that we are about further to consider is No. 3 on the agenda—"Consideration of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations respecting the hours of labour." I would say that, as far as the retail trade of Canada is concerned, there is nothing in the report to discuss, because we have not as a class been considered at all. On that commission there was no one representing the distributor; hence we could not expect to find anything in the report that would fit our class.

We have here to-day seven classes. You have brought a proposition before us which, boiling down the whole argument I have heard from the other side, means 44 hours a week in all industries. You have here, first, the employee; second, the manufacturer; and in another group there are producers, miners, building construction, shipbuilding, fishing—I regret very much that the farmers were left out; third, bankers; fourth, wholesalers; fifth, retailers; sixth, transportation; seventh, musicans and theatrical. Now, this is the grouping, and you come along with a proposal to place this group, without any distinction at all that I have heard, on a basic of a 44-hour week, and you want it by legislation. I think the retail merchants whom I represent, the abused middlemen that everybody is pelting bricks at, are in the best position to discuss this subject in a very frank way, as we stand right between the manufacturers and the producers on the one hand and the consuming public on the other.

Personally I believe that the world is getting very much better than it was years ago. When I was a lad I went to business at seven o'clock in the morning and stayed until eight o'clock at night, and on Saturdays until twelve o'clock at night, but one of my confreres here, who has built up a large retail business in Canada, started at six in the morning and worked until twelve at night, while another worked from seven in the morning until eleven at night. Now we have in every province early closing bylaws, which are taken advantage of, and the retail shops in Ottawa open at nine in the morning and close at six every day in the week; so things are getting better.

The position I take in this matter is that I do not want to prevent other people from getting what we have got. We have legislation which we appreciate, and we ask you not to consider us in this matter at all, as we are perfectly satisfied with the legislation we have. When you say that you want legislation so as to give all industry 44 hours a week—those are the words I particularly noted—I must ask, Mr. Chairman, that you kindly leave us out of it. I am in sympathy with short hours of labour, although I work 18 hours a day myself. But how are you going to make a piece of legislation that will fit the various groups I have just mentioned—manufacturers, employers, bankers, wholesalers, retailers, transportation? You cannot do it, that is all there is to it; you might just as well face the situation exactly as we see it. It cannot be done.

I am delighted that this convention has been called, because I am thoroughly in sympathy with it, and feel that by our getting together, you hear our side, for we have our troubles; we have to carry thousands of dollars worth of stock and pay for it before it is sold in order to have it to show to our customers.

I noticed, Mr. Chairman, that you spoke of 6,615 employers having reported on the hours they employ labour. The retail merchants of this country, with their names over their doors, number 200,000, and they are employers of labour. Are you going to put onto these men the conditions that you would apply to a shipbuilder? Again, there are men who can work only in certain seasons of the year, yet some people would apply the shorter hours to them. There are people who want to see everything alike, to have all the laws alike; but I have a great respect for the Maker of the universe, and I would ask such people why He made every man different in appearance. I have travelled in every part of the world, and yet I never saw another man who looked like me. We are told that there are no two leaves alike, and not even two leaves on a tree exactly alike. I suppose these people who want everything alike would be pleased if we had only one season in the year instead of four different ones. In this Conference you have different conditions, and I am absolutely delighted to know that we are all here together looking at one another and telling one another our troubles. I could take till the end of this Conference telling the troubles of the retail merchants of this country, of grocers who are forced to sell sugar below cost at the instigation of a commission appointed by the Government without having one ordinary business man on it; but you all have your troubles, and we have ours. When this Conference is over I believe we will know and understand one another better, and we will come to this conclusion: Never take any legislation to the Government figuring it out as being labour legislation, without consulting the other interests in this country. If we want Canada to take a standing above all the other nations of the earth, which is my ambition, every one of us must work together, and we must not have one class pulling against the other class; each of us must do our little share in helping to bring about harmony in all these difficult subjects. I thank you.

W. R. TROTTER (Vancouver, B.C.): I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that after this conference is over we shall understand each other better. I am reminded just at this juncture of a person who was called upon to deliver an anniversary address at a certain place and declared proudly that he was a self-made man. A good old lady in the front seat said, "Thank the guid Lord." When she was questioned as to why she had made that remark, she said, "The guid Lord maukna be blamed for it, ditna ye see?"

I just want to correct, from our side of the House, Mr. Chairman, an impression that might be left by one part, at least, of Mr. White's very detailed statement. I was very glad when Colonel Carnegie rose to lift the gloom from this assembly, and our group did not have to do it. I am aware that there are different hours worked in this country, and that we can find people working long hours, as I once found a man working 14 hours a day for seven days a week—in the city of Calgary, no less. A

gentleman in an audience I addressed once called out, "He ought to get married." My reply was that he had not found a woman who was fool enough to want to marry a man who was mad enough to work seven days a week—fourteen hours a day.

The question that I want to come to directly is this. We have heard all those pessimistic things each time we have met any group of employers in negotiating for a shorter work-day, and so long ago as 1906, when the printing trades of the whole North American continent had decided that they would work no longer than eight hours per day after the 1st of January of 1906, we heard the same sentiments expressed as have been expressed by so many speakers in this assembly. We heard the same blue ruin predicted. But I want particularly to draw attention to the results of that decision. Be it known that four years before 1906 the organizations concerned in the printing industry had suggested in a small way to the employers of the whole North American continent that they would agree to a reduction from nine to eight hours a day by accepting a fifteen minutes per year reduction over four years. That seemed to be a very reasonable and sane proposition, but it was not accepted, and the change had to be enforced by the use of what has been termed economic strength, in January, 1906. There was a terrific fight, in which millions were spent on both sides. After that terrific fight what is the result? We have already had the commercial end of that business meet with the representative heads of the printing industry, and they have been so well satisfied with the working of the eight-hour day since the year 1906, when it was instituted, that they have unanimously agreed that on April 1, 1921, the forty-four week shall be put peaceably into operation over the whole North American continent in the commercial printing industry. It is a change from the old attitude of fighting the organization to a position in which they realize the benefits to themselves—of course they could not be expected to view it exactly from our standpoint—and they have actually agreed to institute on a given date a further reduction of hours.

In reply to another point which Mr. White raised, and which might escape the attention of members here, I want to have removed from organized labour, as represented here, or as represented anywhere, the imputation that an attempt is made to reduce the hours of labour in order to secure the high remuneration that would follow were overtime necessary. The organization to which I have already alluded—and it is not a small one—is not seeking a reduction of hours for that purpose. Although members are working in many cases, in the United States particularly, a seven-day week, that is, where seven-day newspapers are printed, any member of the craft who works seven days consecutively must give his seventh day's pay to the organization. He must forfeit it entirely, although he has worked that day. Naturally there is no desire on the part of the membership to work seven days consecutively.

As to the question of overtime, should a man accumulate earnings from overtime, the inexorable law of the organization is that the moment he has accumulated a day in overtime he shall give that to the very first man available, and he is laid off by the chairman in the works—by our own man, not by the employer. So the overtime is of no benefit whatsoever to the man who is called to work it, and he must at the same time lay off when he accumulates one day's time in overtime. I venture to say that members of other crafts would resent, and resent very strongly, any imputation that there is a desire on their part to increase their wages by shortening the hours so that they may get the overtime rate which is supposed to be paid. We do not want any overtime rates. We do not want overtime.

In that same address I noticed that something was said about the absence of immigration for five years. That is not the experience of this country alone; that is the condition everywhere; we are all in the same boat in that respect. But we are repatriating our people now, and soon they will all have returned. But they are not all at work, and I doubt very much whether in the fall of this year they will all be employed. Furthermore, on the 1st of January next we shall be preparing for an influx from the Old Land of from 100,000 to 150,000 Imperial soldiers, whose passages will be paid by the Imperial Government to whatever overseas Dominion they choose to go to. They will have free passages. We are confronted with that factor also. We have got along well up to the present time with the eight-hour day that is now worked by almost 50 per cent of the employees. The influx that we are going to have shows that there will be no shortage of labour; and there is no shortage of labour at the present time. If we are to take care of our economic future in this country and to provide

against unemployment, we must shorten the hours of labour now being worked in this country, in order to furnish employment to that influx in developing the natural resources of this country and obtaining that production about which we have heard so much.

It is true that we have no wealth except that which is produced by labour in application to natural resources. The Israelites long ago passed out of the wilderness where we were told manna fell. We can obtain a living now only by the application of labour to natural resources. You must apply the working people to the natural resources and the production of wealth, and if we are to have greater production we shall need more labourers. We have in this country, as has been said, wonderful natural resources to which labour may be applied, and it should be applied scientifically, just as labour was scientifically distributed during the war by those who were charged with that duty. In the words of the Tennyson Committee that sat over in the Old Land and dealt with the question of emigration from the Empire to this and other countries, or, as it was put, migration within the Empire, if the Empire and the Dominions could apply their minds to the scientific distribution of man-power and the centering of man-power where it was needed during four years of conflict, then the Empire and the Dominions ought to get together and see that the man-power, not only of the old land, but of all countries within the Empire, is scientifically distributed during the period of peace in order that we may obtain that production and that wealth which are needed to maintain the British Empire and enable it to keep the place it has held hitherto among the nations of the earth—a place from which it is now apparently receding, according to financial standards.

Mr. E. G. HENDERSON: As I said yesterday, this is a great Convention, possibly the greatest that has ever been held in Canada, and I feel quite sure that before we leave here, as has already been stated, we shall know each other better. I do hope that in the various matters we shall arrive at some compromise which will prevent any great division.

For the last four and a half years we have seen and we have felt the effects of physical conflict. God forbid that we should fail to do our best to prevent any industrial conflict. I am not going to discuss this matter for any one party or any one section, but shall try to take a broad view of it. We are discussing the second item on the agenda, which reads as follows:

Consideration of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations respecting hours of labour.

I am going to try to keep to that subject as closely as I can, without drawing in any other matters. This recommendation, I suppose, was occasioned by the recommendation of the Industrial Relations Commission which was appointed by the Government. The commission was composed of six members and the chairman. For that commission and for the chairman I have the highest regard and highest respect. The commission, in making its report, was not unanimous. I heard it stated this morning that its findings were based on evidence, but I do not think the chief justice who was the chairman, or any member of that commission, would say that the statements made before it were evidence in any sense of the term. These statements were unchallenged and unchecked, and there must have been a diversity of opinion amongst the members of the commission regarding them. I would draw your attention particularly to paragraph 67 on page 19 of the report, which reads as follows:

Many opinions were expressed by workers on this proposition.

I shall read section 67:

We found at the great majority of places visited a demand by the workers for a shorter working day, based on their desires for more leisure and energy to devote to the things of life other than work, and a general approval by the employers in regard to this.

I do not know what that section means. However, it does not make any difference. I turn from there to the minority report, which is signed by Hon. Senator White and Mr. Pound. On page 29 I find:

In many industries where the work exacts great physical effort on the part of the worker, there is no doubt the eight-hour, or even a shorter day, might be not only fair but necessary, but in other industries where the condition of labour is not so exacting there did not appear to be any great desire for a shorter day unless a corresponding increased wage was granted.

That is the minority report. The members of the commission were divided as to the evidence—and I am using that word as it has been used here, although it was not evidence at all.

Now, I want to know the reason for the demand for the legislation for an eight-hour day. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the gentlemen who introduced this. There were two reasons advanced:

One was the physical reason, and the other was the desire that men might have more time for enjoyment. I have not heard—and unfortunately I have not the evidence—whether the commission had any physicians or experts give evidence regarding the eight-hour day. Speaking for myself, when Col. Carnegie addressed this house, he practically repeated my own history, only that instead of saying 35 years ago I would have had to add another ten; and I can assure you that I worked just as hard as any of the men here do, from 6 o'clock in the morning to 6 at night. And since then I have worked very often 18 or 20 hours a day, and I can assure you I would rather work 12 hours with my hands than work, as I have done, with what brains I have. I do not think that the work I have done has affected me physically. However, I am in favour of the eight-hour day, but I am utterly opposed to any legislation which would make the eight-hour day compulsory. There are trades and industries in which the eight-hour day is practically essential—underground work, work in chemical factories and other places where such conditions prevail as render it difficult. In fact, I would say that in my friend, Mr. McGregor's, works I believe the eight-hour day is essential, because there are few factories where the human machine is made so efficient as in the factories of the Ford Company, and I grant you in such industries an eight-hour day is requisite.

However, the objection I have at the present time to the introduction of any such legislation as is proposed is this. We heard yesterday from Mr. Stone that the great cause of unrest was the high cost of living. I myself believe there are other reasons, which I will not enumerate. But let us take as one of them the high cost of living. Now, just as surely as you cut down the hours of labour you are going to cut down production. I do not care what any man says, it is utterly impossible for anyone to do as much work in eight hours as he can do in a longer time.

I did not catch exactly what Colonel Carnegie said, but we were told by Mr. Lloyd-George, according to a statement which I read in the paper—I am sorry I have not the statement here—that just as sure as the hours of labour are reduced, production is reduced in mathematical proportion. I may be wrong in that, but that is what I read.

Mr. M. P. WHITE: We have it here.

Mr. E. G. HENDERSON: Another cause of unrest which I think is a very great factor, although it was not mentioned by Mr. Stone, is the lack of houses and housing accomodation. Complaint is made on every hand of the high cost of houses, the difficulty of securing them and the high rents which have to be paid. Now, ladies and gentlemen, is it possible, by any means that you can conceive, for a man to do in eight hours as much as he can do in ten? "Oh," you may say, "the man will work ten hours if necessary." That is quite true, but he gets time and a half. What is the practical result? The increase in the cost of houses is greatly augmented. In the building of houses I should think it means that 50 per cent of the cost is for labour. If you are going to make the eight-hour day compulsory by a general law you are going to increase the cost of production. In my profession as an engineer a great any years ago I was in contact with tradesmen, and at that time it was quite ordinary for a bricklayer to lay 2,200 bricks a day. I do not know—I may be wrong—but I think the average number of bricks laid to-day by a good bricklayer—not pressed brick or anything of that kind—would be 800.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, as I say, I am in favour of the eight-hour day, but before we pass any such legislation we ought to consider it very carefully. We ought to find out what effect it is going to have on the great community who are not here—what effect it is going to have on the farmers. They are the ones who are going to pay. Then there is another class of men who are not represented here—teachers, preachers, men who are on salaries. What is going to be the effect on them? We have to consider that, and we must not be so selfish as to consider ourselves only. If an employer thought he was going to get more work done in eight hours than in a longer day, would he not be an infernal ass if he would not favour the eight-hour day? Who wants to pay for wear and tear on machinery, who wants to pay for light and for overhead for a longer period, if he is going to get an equal amount of work done in eight hours? Why, gentlemen, the thing is absurd. But, as I said, I am in favour of the eight-hour day and think we should aim at eight hours, and in some cases possibly less; but do not let us suggest to the provincial premiers, because I think that after all they will have to deal with the question, that an eight-hour law should be the law of the country.

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Dunning, of the Saskatchewan Provincial Government, desires to make a few remarks and to get some information.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: As one of the group of provincial government members, located very properly, I think, at the centre table, it is not my intention to take part in the debate. We are ranged as I say very properly, between the upper millstone of capital on the one side and the lower millstone of labour on the other. I conceive our position to be that of men receiving advice and looking for instruction, and the position of those on either side to be that of instructors. For that reason I desire to direct the attention of the Conference to a phase of this question which is not receiving the consideration to which I believe it is entitled.

Coming as I do from probably the greatest agricultural province in the Dominion, I think I should call to your attention the fact that probably the greatest number of industrial workers in Canada, manual workers, are engaged in the industry of agriculture, and that it is a mistake for either capital or labour to deal with this very important question of the hours of labour without giving full consideration to the effect which your proposals may have upon the industry of agriculture and upon the manual labourers engaged in that industry.

The farmer occupies a peculiar position. Generally speaking, he is both a capitalist and a labourer, and as a such I think is in a very favourable position in these troublous times. It may be, judging from the report which we have before us, that it is the intention to include the industry of agriculture in any legislation that is asked for in respect to hours of labour. That may be practicable; but it seems to me, as a farmer of very long experience, that until it is possible for you to legislate to control the sun and the wind and the clouds and the rain, it is impracticable for you to legislate to effectively control the hours and the distribution of labour in agriculture. There may be some method of overcoming that difficulty, but it will be possible only by the inclusion in the bulk, the aggregate bulk of farm labour, of a great surplus during periods when it is impossible to do farm work. It is quite impracticable to think of taking on and laying off men in connection with farm work in the same manner as it is done in connection with the manufacturing industry. Not only is it impossible to get men to work on the farms under those conditions, but it would be impossible to transport them back and forth from one place to another. Too much time would be wasted.

I want to ask the advice of this Conference as to the matter of dealing with the hours of labour on the farm. You may say: "We will leave it out; we will let agriculture take care of itself." But if you do that, you must face the fact that you cannot set hours of labour, or working conditions, or wages, in connection with all the other industries, without very materially affecting the agricultural industry. At the present time one of the great difficulties in connection with western agriculture is the securing of a regular supply of efficient labour. The reason for it is probably partly the natural gregarious instinct of mankind; they tend to herd together in cities. That is a tendency very much deplored by economists and others to-day. If you make working conditions in the cities more attractive, will you not naturally accelerate the drift of workers towards the city, thus causing a depletion in the rural districts, which is said to have a very great effect on the cost of living. As a representative of probably the greatest agricultural province in the Dominion, I want your answer to that problem.

I am not arguing either for or against the standardization of the hours of labour. Whether it is to be seven hours or eight hours, that is the business of this Conference; but I do know that whatever you decide to ask for will have an effect on the greatest industry in Canada, and I want you to take that into consideration in your deliberations, if you will be kind enough to do so.

Mr. JAMES WINNING (Winnipeg): Mr. Chairman and delegates, much has been said and much has been written in the press and the magazines of this country about what was going to be done at this Conference of capital and labour. I hope that we do not talk all week, and then go home without doing anything. I hope that at the end of the week we shall have done something concrete, so that we may be able to go back to our homes and tell the members of our organizations, and the men and women who live in our communities, that the Government of this country is going to enact legislation that will be in the best interests of the working class of this country.

At the moment we are discussing the question of the eight-hour day. I think the intelligence of the labour group here will admit that there are certain sections of industry in which we cannot enforce the

eight-hour day at the present time. But there is no reason in the world why we could not have an Act that would make eight hours a day the maximum in those industries where it is practicable, and exempting those where it is found to be impracticable.

I have listened with a very great deal of profit and pleasure to some of the gentlemen on the other side relating their experiences when they went to work, and how hard they worked. I should like to remind them that in those days, when they went to work at 14 years of age and were working hard, either in the mine or in the factory, their brothers were fighting the governments of the day to get a reduction of hours. The same argument was put up by the boss when 12 hours was the standard, and when they were fighting for a nine or ten-hour day they found the same argument trotted out that is being trotted out to-day.

It has been said that a reduction in the hours of labour may mean a proportionate decrease in production. I do not know whether that is true or not. We probably reach a point of physical endurance when we are not able to produce a given quantity in a given time; but I think sufficient statistics have been compiled in this country to prove that the industries that have adopted the eight-hour day have produced just as much as they did with the nine or even the ten-hour day, so I do not think we have much to lose on that score.

It has been said that two elements enter into the question of the reduction of hours, the human element and the economic element. In treating any of the subjects that are on the agenda we have got a great working class to consider; industry cannot get along without them any more than the working class can get along without the employers. Unless we can arrive at some harmonious conclusion then, we are not going to get very far. Irrespective of whether or not things will mete out as we should like them to, there is a great desire on the part of the working class that the eight-hour day should be established, and you cannot afford to ignore that desire. That is the important point. You cannot afford to ignore the under-rumblings of that great class which is outside of this building to-day.

The country, and the Government of the country, at this time look forward to an increased production in order to pay the interest on the expenditures incurred in the great war. The Government recognizes that the first thing to be done is to decrease the cost of living, which is a problem even greater than the war itself. I do not know of anything that would tend to decrease production and the wealth of the country more than a month's strike would do. If we can avoid two or three or four weeks' strike by enacting legislation, we shall be doing something in the interests of the country and shall be helping the Government of the country.

In conclusion, I want to leave it as firmly impressed on the minds of the employers as I can, that whilst it may seem on the surface to-day that we have industrial peace, industrial ferment may break out at any time, and the eight-hour day will be one of the questions involved. I ask you to give serious consideration in sending this matter to the Committee. I hope that we shall have a favourable return, and that by co-operation we may be able to have eight-hour day legislation enacted.

Mr. ROBERT BAXTER (Glace Bay, N.S.): Mr. Chairman, and fellow delegates: I cannot tell you how pleased I am to be here, and how pleased I am that this question is being discussed and is receiving the attention that ought to be given to it, because if we do not settle it now we are going out to face industrial strife.

We have heard that much of the difficulties of production. Why do we have periods of small production, and why do we have periods of intensive production? Do you men on the other side of the House maintain that at times we are inefficient and at other times very efficient? We on this side agree with you that when production is small we have depression and sometimes hardship. The depression does not affect only you; it affects the workers and the country in general. When production is large we have a period of prosperity; we agree with you on that point. But if we get down to the cause of the matter, we shall find the reason for production being small. The reason is that there is no demand for the product of our labour; consequently we have a large army of unemployed, and for the same reason the earnings of capital are small. That is the condition at present, but a shorter working day is going to alleviate that condition, because we will set a medium course between those two points. If you produce in abundance, in the course of time there is no necessity for labour, and there being no necessity for labour, there is no necessity for the workers to work.

Miss Gutteridge referred to the time just before the war. Previous to the war we had hundreds of thousands of men out of work. We were told at that time that those men

were idle simply because they did not want to work; but that statement has been proven to be untrue, for when the war began, when there were jobs for every one, we had no army of unemployed, it had totally disappeared. Behind this whole question is the matter of over-production; and while the eight-hour day may not effect a complete cure, at least it will remedy conditions to some extent.

There is another feature of the eight-hour day. It would give the labourer any opportunity to study. If we had intelligent, well-educated labour in this country, it would be a great asset to the country. It would enable the workers and their employers to get together in times of stress and to discuss problems, and you would understand our difficulties and we would understand yours. Let us settle this question here.

We should recognize that since the war ended the workers in Germany have a shorter day, some of them a seven-hour day; in France they have a shorter day; we also know that in Britain a shorter working-day for a large section of the people has been recognized. They waited until it came to a crisis. Do not let us wait. The statement read by the Minister of Labour shows that if we had a forty-four hour week, it would not not be such a very great change. We might suffer a loss for a short time, but we would more than make it up by industrial peace.

Mr. TOM MOORE: I rise to a question of privilege. I just noticed that by an unfortunate oversight two members of the labour group have spoken consecutively. It is not our desire that such should take place, and in order to re-establish the equilibrium I suggest that two on the opposite now go ahead without any interference.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER (Toronto): In view of the remark just made, I would like to say that so far as I am individually concerned I should consider it most deplorable if there were any arbitrary rule that there should be one speaker on one side and then one on the other. I should very much regret to find my friends feeling bound in any such way.

The CHAIRMAN: May I call the attention of the Conference to the fact that we have not yet finished the second number on the agenda, and that it is important that all the matters under consideration should be disposed of this week. I trust that the delegates will endeavour, so far as possible, to aid in the consideration of the various subjects before them, and be sharp on time to-morrow morning at ten o'clock. We propose to open the Conference at ten o'clock sharp, regardless of whether all are here or not. I hope you will all do the best you can. We will now stand adjourned.

The Conference adjourned until to-morrow at 10 a.m.

CANADA

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

of Dominion and Provincial Governments with Representative Employers and Labour Men at Ottawa, September, 1919.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINCS AND DISCUSSIONS

THIRD DAY.

The Senate Chamber,

Ottawa, Wednesday, September 17, 1919.

CONTENTS.

Hours of Labour—Further discussion—Question referred to Committee.

Addresses by R. Thomson, C. McCutcheon, J. F. Gregory, J. A. Gillies, J. S. McKinnon, J. A. McClelland, Col T. Cantley, S. R. Parsons, E. W. A. O'Dell, M. P. White.

Minimum Wage Laws—Discussion—Question referred to Committee.

Addresses by A. Monro Grier, Miss Helena Gutteridge, E. Parnell, W. Mackenzie, J. B. Thompson, E. M. Trowern.

Visitors from Abroad—Greetings to and Addresses by H. B. Butler, E. J. Trigg, J. C. Frazee.

Organization of Labour—Discussion on Right to Organize, Recognition of Unions, and Right of Collective Bargaining.

Addresses by W. L. Best, S. R. Parsons, C. H. Carlisle, J. R. Shaw.

MORNING SESSION.

The Conference met at 10 a.m., Hon. Senator Gideon D. Robertson, Minister of Labour, presiding.

Mr. Gerald H. Brown acted as Secretary of the Conference.

In addition to those in attendance on the first and second days of the Conference whose names were given in the reports of the proceedings for those respective days, there were present to-day the following:

Hon. T. C. Mathers, Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench of Manitoba, late Chairman of the Royal Commission of Inquiry on Industrial Relations in Canada.

Sir Charles Gordon, K.B.E., Chairman Canadian Trade Commission, Montreal.

P. Burns, of P. Burns and Company, Calgary.

William Rutherford, of William Rutherford and Sons, Montreal.

R. E. Jamieson, Canadian Consolidated Rubber Company, Montreal.

Arthur D. Miles, President International Nickel Company of Canada, Toronto.

Blake Wilson, of P. Burns and Company, Vancouver, B.C.

Major R. P. Rogers, Cobalt.

As substitutes for delegates whose names were printed in the report of the first day's proceedings, the following were present:

Blake Wilson, Vancouver, B.C., for J. J. Coughlan, Vancouver, B.C., for the Employers.

H. I. Thomas, Ottawa, for T. B. Wilson, Sault Ste. Marie, for the Employers.

T. E. Rice, Sydney, N.S., for Mark Workman, Sydney, N.S., for the Employers.

The name of the following delegate, who was present both yesterday and to-day, was inadvertently omitted from the list of delegates representing the Canadian Bankers' Association, printed in the report of yesterday's proceedings:

J. P. Bell, General Manager Bank of Hamilton, Hamilton, Ont.

HOURS OF LABOUR.

FURTHER DISCUSSION — THE QUESTION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE.

The CHAIRMAN: When we adjourned last night we were engaged in discussing Item No. 2 on the revised agenda. If there is no objection we will proceed from where we left off. A gentleman to my left had the floor at that time. If he desires the floor this morning, it is his privilege.

Mr. R. THOMSON (Carleton Place): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen,—Last evening, just prior to the closing of the session, I rose following two very able addresses by gentlemen on the other side of the House, but this is the first time I have had the opportunity of addressing this audience. As we all have a certain amount of something to say—to get off our chests, so to speak—with the others, let me say how pleased I am, how pleased we all are, with the wonderful beginning which was made on the first day of the Conference—with the message of the Prime Minister, and the speeches of the representatives of the Government and the gentlemen who addressed this audience. We are seemingly divided into the two sides of the House. That was not intended to be. We have come here, each respecting the other, but at the same time here and there we may run across differences of opinion. As this is a Conference, and a Conference only, we need not necessarily expect that those differences will be altogether adjusted here and a conclusion come to on all matters.

When we left off yesterday, we were discussing the question of the hours of labour. In Clause 48 of the Report of the Industrial Commission we find this subject dealt with in this way:

> Many opinions were expressed by workers on this proposition. The most common request was for an eight-hour day with the Saturday half holiday, where already established, and its further extension wherever possible, thus making the forty-hour week.

So we are really discussing more particularly, not an eight-hour day, but a forty-four hour week. The first lady delegate spoke on this question. May I stop here to congratulate Miss Gutteridge on being the first lady to address an assembly of this kind, and may I congratulate her on the splendid way in which she presented her case. Miss Gutteridge, we on this side of the House admire you much. We cannot agree with the conclusions you have arrived at, but at the same time I very heartily congratulate you. Miss Gutteridge, in her speech, said: "They offer us, as a compromise, a forty-four hour week." We do not know what the ultimate aim and desire and expectation of labour is. As a compromise they were offered forty-four hours.

I do not think it is within the province of the labour organizations as called here, representing, as they do, about 10 per cent of the labour in Canada—we say 10 per cent, although it is not 10. We do not know that they speak even for the whole 10 per cent, because we find oftentimes in strikes that the men striking are not striking necessarily because they wish to, but because they dare not do otherwise. Certainly this 10 per cent does no represent the 90 per cent of unorganized labour. Therefore I say it is not within their province to offer, or within our province to accept, proposals which may be made in this regard. The number of hours required to do the labour of the world is the number of hours in which it can be done. It is very well to read statistics gathered together and formulate it from past history in other lands; but this is a new country, and believe me, by your tongues I know that some of you men were not born in this country, but have come here from other lands. Had you come here earlier and to hew out homes, as our forefathers did, you might have a different viewpoint. Our forefathers did not know an eight-hour day or a ten-hour day; they only knew that they worked hard until, as Miss Gutteridge said, the elastic was well stretched.

We must approach this thing with the thought that all life is a development; all progress is a step-by-step development. We have arrived at our present position gradually. It is not long since a ten-hour day was general in Canada in a number of trades; to-day in many trades eight hours prevail, or fifty hours a week, or forty-eight hours a week. We know that 44 hours consists of 5 days of 8 hours, making 40 hours, and 4 hours on Saturday. There is no question but that you have it in mind to get this 44-hour week to-day, and next year you may say, "Well, Saturday is a poor day to work; don't work Saturday; make it 40 hours. Why not make it 40 hours?

Some LABOUR DELEGATES: Hear, hear,

Mr. R. THOMSON: And in the making of it 40 hours, do not holler if you have to pay more for your goods.

Some EMPLOYERS' DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

A LABOUR DELEGATE: We are paying that already.

Mr. R. THOMSON: No, you are not. Don't holler. Don't you, Colonel Carnegie, or any other man, tell me that it will not have that effect, because you are regulating now, or endeavouring to get legislation to regulate, all industry. Do not tell me that in 48 hours you can produce what was produced in 53, or that in 43 hours you can produce what was produced in 48, or that in 40 hours you can produce what was produced in 43, because it is not so.

Colonel D. CARNEGIE: The gentleman has named me. I want to say that I was speaking of conditions that exist in England. I said that automatic machinery changed conditions. It is obvious to the ordinary man that if an automatic machine is working at full efficiency for 8 hours, and at the same efficiency for 10 hours, there is no argument as to production. Where manual labour comes in, where the human element comes in, I have facts to show that production was not diminished by the 8-hour day.

Mr. THOMSON: I quite understand what Colonel Carnegie said, and I quite agree with him as far as it may go; but Colonel Carnegie or any other man who is lending his influence and making his address in the way of trying to obtain an 8-hour day or a less hour production does come under the consideration of which I am now speaking. Where automatic or other machinery is the basic part of production, the labour on it may be large or may be little; but there must be machine-tenders and they may be exhausted or they may not, and we must always have consideration for the human element and see that labour is not being unduly taxed. I will agree with you, and I think we on this side of the House will agree, that whatever the hours may be, whether 8 hours or 7 hours, where the bodily health and strength of the man or woman is reduced in vitality or lessened in the years where there should be a fairly reasonable chance of existence, those hours should be reduced, and we will agree that they should be reduced. If you had come to this Conference and said, "We do not ask for a general 8-hour day or a 44-hour week, but we do ask for it in certain lines of industry" and naming those industries, because you have examined into them; and if you state, "This is an industry where a man has sweated his blood, sweated the sweat out of his body, where a woman has worked until she has stretched the elastic so that it is nearly broken," then we will meet you.

Sometimes I have wondered just how much some men who represent labour have worked or do work themselves. I will venture to say that Mr. Moore or Mr. Bruce or others of you men who stood up yesterday, who are leaders in your organizations, do not work by the time-clock, but work as many hours as are required. Now, we are not declaiming against the most reasonable conditions, for we are reasonable men, not slave-drivers. I have occupied a position employing more men than many of you, perhaps, have had any relations with; but I have not in mind any period when I had no sympathy and did not ameliorate the condition of and help those who suffered, who were in need; and the conditions are gradually getting better day by day, and they are going to get better. But there is a line to be drawn as to production, where we can get for our needs and the country's needs sufficient production on a reasonable cost basis. I do not know and you do not know where that line is, and you are not satisfied to draw the line at 48 hours or 44 hours. I do not know where your line is. Is it 36 hours? Is it 30 hours? Or shall we hope that by luck we may have a condition such as one speaker mentioned yesterday when the children of Israel received the manna from heaven? Believe me, boys, you cannot get something for nothing; and believe me again when I tell you that labour is not an evil or an injury, but it is a blessing to mankind. I know what labour is because I laboured long and often and much. I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: There are four or five gentlemen standing, but Mr. McCutcheon is recognized as having the floor because yesterday he stood up three times to get the floor.

One of the labour leaders suggested that we should adopt parliamentary practice in our debates as much as possible. One of the unalterable rules in parliamentary practice is that in addressing the House a speaker, when referring to what has been said, shall not name any individual because

it does not tend to promote the spirit that we are all endeavouring to maintain at this time.

Mr. C. McCUTCHEON (Winnipeg): It has been quite in order for previous speakers to refer to the time they worked when they were young, and to the age at which they went to work. I am going to be no exception, and will say that I went to work when I was eleven years old. I was raised on a farm, and we had an 8-hour day. The only trouble with that arrangement was that we worked two 8-hour days in each 24-hour period. We worked that time not because we liked to work, but because we could not do otherwise. Some speakers would attempt to convey the impression that they worked those long hours because they liked them; but I did not.

The last speaker referred to the fact that we represent only a small proportion of labour, possibly 10 per cent. That is true. There is another organized body of labour that we do not represent here to-day; that is what is know as the extremists. They are the only other body of organized workers that is in existence in this country except the moderates, who are here to-day. I want to remind the gentlemen on the other side of the House that you have here to-day the moderates; you have not the extremists; but for the good of the gentlemen on the left I am going to try to express the views of the extremists, as it will possibly be of interest to this gathering to know just what they are thinking, because they are becoming an important factor in all countries.

The last speaker referred to the fact that if we had a 40-hour week we would pay more for our goods. Now, labour is quite aware that it cannot receive more in real wages than labour produces—and when I refer to labour I mean all that mental and physical human energy that enters into wealth production; and if labour works only 40 hours it follows that labour will receive only what labour can produce in 40 hours—providing, of course, that everybody labours. That is possibly the trouble to-day, and it is the viewpoint of the extremists that we have possibly 80 per cent who are not labouring.

Somebody has said, "Let us increase production," but one of the ways that we might increase production is to put some of those who are not at present engaged in necessary useful labour at that occupation. Of course, that cannot refer to the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, because one of their speakers assured us that they were all labouring men. Just how it will affect the third party in this conference, of course they are best fitted to say. The extremist is taking this view: why should labour work longer than is required for labour to produce enough to satisfy labour's wants? Somebody asks, "What is the limitation?" That should be the limitation; that should measure the limit of the labours of mankind. If mankind can do the trick in 7 hours, we will say, is there any good reason why we should work longer than 7-hours?—unless it is true, as intimated from the opposite side of the House, that we just live to work. A lot of us are taking a different viewpoint—that we are working to live; that is the reason why we work. If we take the other viewpoint, that production is carried on to increase our exportable surplus, to satisfy the wants of those who are not engaged in useful labour, then of course the 8-hour day is not the correct method to pursue, but in fact we should lengthen the hours. The ideal country, in that view, would be Japan, for, if the figures that are made public are correct, Japan is in the best position to-day to increase her export trade. Yet I do not think even the gentlemen on the left would be proud or would desire to have the conditions in Canada that prevail in Japan, where they are working from 12 to 14 hours a day. In that country they have no National Industrial Conference to settle this problem, to the best of our knowledge, largely because labour there is as yet content to work 12 or 14 hours a day. Possibly labour over there will commence to wake up, and then they will have a National Conference that will have to solve their problems. The 8-hour day, or the 44-hour week, as outlined by the moderates, if agreed to by the opposite side of the House, will at least have this effect, that it will go a certain length to satisfy the demands of the extremists. But, in reply to the last speaker, I am going to say that after we have the 8-hour day, the 44-hour week, if we discover that we have a great big body of unemployed, whether those unemployed be workers who are seeking jobs or other people who are largely parasiting on production, then we will demand that the hours be further shortened, so that we can pass on the blessing of labour, as mentioned by the last speaker, to all, and let all be engaged in production.

Mr. J. FRASER GREGORY (St. John, N.B.): Mr. Chairman and delegates, I am here representing the lumber interest of Canada, an interest that is second only to agriculture, and I have been asked to speak

particularly on seasonal occupations. I would like to use the whole 10 minutes at my command in generalizing, but if I did so I would have no time to speak on my special point. Before I start on that, however, I would say that I have been in the lumbering business since 1881, when labour unions were practically unknown, and that in the period of time that has elapsed since then there has been a great improvement in the personnel of the leaders of labour; and I trust that that will continue so that the extremist will eventually be cut out, and the fair-minded men will be the representatives of labour, always bearing in mind British fair play.

You want to remember that the gentlemen on this side of the House who are employers of labour are only captains of industry, and that they have their problems just as largely as you have yours, and that there should be no selfishness on either side. You want to bear in mind that, on account of the great war we have had, the Dominion Government takes toll of all excess profits and reduces the earnings of capital to a minimum, and that the excess profits are paid by the employers of labour, or by the different industries, to the Government; and in your demand you want to remember that yours is not the only demand that is made upon the industries of this country. Those industries can stand just so much expense and no more, and they will collapse and fall down if there is not British fair play between not only the two parties particularly interested—capital and labour, or employers and employees; but we must always remember that there is the great third party, the general public, who are quite as much interested, or even more interested, in the problem of securing the most that they can for their money regardless of what either of us may think.

In reference to the seasonal occupations of Canada, we must remember that Canada's climate and daylight conditions are as extreme as those in any country on the face of the earth. Within the Tropics they have practically 12 hours daylight and 12 hours dark; but in Canada we have long winters with short daylight, and we have the most glorious summers with long daylight when men are able to work, and I think they should of necessity work. In the winter time there is an enforced idleness, except in factories. Therefore seasonal occupations should be pursued to their utmost in the summer time, and the fixing of hours of labour should not take place. All out-door occupations in the summer time are practically seasonal occupations. Building is a seasonal occupation; we cannot get in our foundations in winter, although we may finish buildings then. The building of railways is a seasonal occupation, and must take place in the summer time. Farming must of necessity be done in the summer. There is no extension of contracts with seasonal occupations. If a thing that should be done in the winter time, such as the cutting of spruce logs, is not done fully and completely before the spring heats come, those logs remain in the woods until the next year. If stream-driving is not done when there is water to drive, it cannot be done, and it must be done without hampering. If lumber is to be manufactured, it must be manufactured during the summer season; it cannot be done when the rivers and the ponds are frozen, so that the logs cannot be taken out of them.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we are not employing in seasonal industries to any great extent the weaker class in the community. The lumbermen go into the woods in the winters with the best of mankind with the ablest of men. They are going as an army to battle, to fight nature and wrest from her in ample time the toll that is expected by that particular industry or community for the winter, and we should not be hampered by an 8-hour day; because as a matter of fact in the winter time we do not get an 8-hour day, and in that winter season, if the logs are not got to the streams while the snow is on the ground, they stay there for one year. You must remember also that in agriculture and in the lumbering business there is only one turnover of profit in the year. The stream-driving is done in the spring. The stream-drivers are a body of men who go forth to battle like an army—as we went to meet the Germans. They know the hardships of it. There is not a weakling among them. They know they are going to work from daylight till dark, and each and every one is taking pride in the occupation and doing all that mortal man can do to bring the logs to market. During the summer season the men know the stunt that they have to perform, and they work and should work hard to help get the logs to the mill. The mills in this section of the community can work only about six months in the year. The overhead expense in connection with lumbering operations, in connection with milling, is, I think, larger, probably on account of the enforced idleness, than it is in any other industry.

If for no other reason than to try to get lumber within the reach of the consumer at a moderate price, the hours of labour should not be legislated with.

The export trade of Canada is very largely made up of lumber, and the true wealth of the country is the wealth that is brought in from the outside. Therefore our lumber must go overseas to Great Britain, to the West Indies, to South America, to France, and even to Germany. If we cannot produce lumber as cheaply as other nations do, we shall not be able to sell our commodities. The buyer of lumber will buy from whatever district or point he can buy most cheaply; there is no sentiment in that kind of trade; and, in fixing the hours for seasonal employment and for lumbering, we must of necessity consider international viewpoints.

Now, I have talked about our going forth as an army to battle and working hard. You may say that I have talked about longer hours. One great big redeeming feature in the matter of the lumbering industry, which does not exist in ordinary factory work, is that the same people who cut the logs are those who drive the logs—in most instances the same people who manufacture them. You have all heard it said that a change is as good as a rest, and, in the changes of occupation that we have in lumbering from season to season, it is not true that the workmen are over-fatigued or have reached their limit when they have worked only eight hours, because each and every mill is equipped with modern machinery, and to-day there is practically little or no manual work in connection with the manufacturing of logs into lumber. This ought to be borne in mind in considering the seasonal occupations of the country.

There has been a great deal of talk about speeding up, and it has been stated that as much work can be performed in eight hours as in nine. We have speeded up the sawmills all that we can, because reductions in the hours of labour have taken place already, and the logs have been so small in size from year to year that we have had to speed up as much as possible; and I want to say: if an employee has done all that he could in nine hours he cannot do more in eight. My old father, whom I respect and revere, said to me more than once, when I used to think that I did not get the deserved amount of praise for my work as a boy: "If you do all that you can, you have only done your duty." I say to each and every one of the employees here, when you have done all that you can in the time that you give your employer, you have only done your duty, and you cannot render more service in eight hours than in nine or ten.

Mr. JOHN A. GILLES (Sydney, N.S.): Mr. Chairman, Honourable Gentlemen of the Provincial Governments of our country, Ladies and Gentlemen: I have been an interested listener to the age-old argument against the reduction in hours or the amelioration of the condition of the workers of the country. Pardon me if I use the term labour, because it may be urged against me, as was said by some gentlemen on the left yesterday, that we are trying to raise class distinctions here in Canada; but let me assure you that such is not my object.

Away back fifty or sixty years ago, when the first efforts were being made to reduce the hours of labour, the gentlemen who occupied the same position as my friends on the left had the very same arguments to offer as to why it should not be done. When the women were labouring in the mines in England for 14 and 15 hours a day, the operators in that country had the very same arguments to bring forward.

Let us come down nearer to our own day. In 1894, when a meeting of the textile operators took place in the city of Boston for the purpose of considering a reduction of the hours of children in the factories from 12 to 10 per day, the then president of the Arkwright Club stated that if this was done it was going to take the very heart's blood out of the textile industry. But, ladies and gentlemen, the hours of labour in that case were reduced to 10 and they have since been reduced to eight, and the textile industry is flourishing as it never flourished before in the history of the country.

In 1894 the Master Builders' Association of the United States spent over two million and a half of dollars to combat the attempt made by the building trades to reduce the hours of labour; but when, in spite of all the opposition that was put up, in spite of all the bitterness engendered, the men secured that at which they were aiming, the then president of the Master Builders' Association of the United States admitted that had they known the benefits that would be derived from the shortening of the hours of labour, in the increased efficiency of their people, they would not have spent one dollar.

Now, the aim and object of the curtailment of the hours of labour is not to stifle production. We contend and we believe that the force of the argument is on our side, that the shortening of the hours of

labour renders the men more efficient and consequently better able to give an honest day's work for an honest day's pay.

Reams and reams of statistics have been gotten up by gentlemen who have made a life study of the physiological effect of the long hours of labour. Professor Woods Hutchinson, of the State of New York, who made an exhaustive study of this subject, conclusively proves that the monotony, if not the racking, of labour in industry is what renders men inefficient. The Rev. Charles Stelzle, a Presbyterian minister, also of New York, donned overalls and went out into the factories, into the mills—he even worked at the Fore River Shipbuilding Company's works bucking up rivets—for the purpose of getting the viewpoint of the men engaged in manual labour; and Rev. Mr. Stelzle has told us time and again that he found more loyalty, more of the spirit of co-operation, and more efficiency, in the industries where the employers were willing to concede that the labour was entitled to just and fair treatment.

We believe that every dollar in the shape of capital legitimately invested in an enterprise is worthy of legitimate returns to those who have invested it; but we contend, on the other hand, that long hours of labour and other speeding-up processes for the purpose of earning dividends on air and water are no part of the business of the workers of this country. I represent the employees in an industry where the average working day for continuous operation is 11 hours by day and 13 by night, with a 48-hour day coming at the end of the week in order to change over from a night to a day operation. I speak of the steel industry. I am sure there is no gentleman opposite but will concede that in such occupations the hours of labour are entirely too long, when you take into consideration the racking effect that the work has on the stamina of the worker.

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. JOHN A. GILLES: I suppose the gentlemen will say, "Well, if you are a steel worker, you have possibly stood it very well."

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. JOHN A. GILLES: But may I say that among those of you at the left who have made the most, there are those who have engaged in manual labour for the last 40 or 50 years and you point to yourselves as being remarkably well-preserved. May it not be said that possibly your paths have been brighter than those of some members on this side, who have been found to work the longest hours without any change from the monotony.

Now, we hope and trust that this meeting of interests may be productive of some good—that it may allay that spirit of unrest that is rampant throughout our country to-day. Let us approach this subject in a spirit of fair play. A gentleman on the opposite side has mentioned that we should adopt the spirit of fair play. I say, then, let us do so by all means, and how can you expect loyalty from your employees if you ask that that loyalty be all one-sided. We are not asking for very much.

Some other gentleman has made the remark that the product of labour would increase materially as the hours of labour were shortened. Now, let us consider that question for a moment. Under our present economic condition, especially in large industries, what do we find? We find that the manufacturer has a certain standard of profit that he adopts. If his employees succeed in wresting a few more cents per hour from him he passes that on to the ultimate consumer, but he will try to maintain his profits intact. Now, gentlemen, if we are going to get anywhere, if we are going to make this Canada of ours one of the greatest and most glorious countries on God's footstool we must be fair with you, but you will have to admit that you must give up a little more of what you were hitherto pleased to term profits.

Mr. J. S. McKINNON (Toronto): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I would like to congratulate you, sir, and the Government of which you are an honoured member, upon the success so far of this historic gathering. There was yesterday an incident which, I think, must have pleased us all, when a distinguished member on the opposite side of the House spoke of becoming acquainted and forming a friendship upon a railway tie beside a railway wreck in Canada, and when an honoured member of this side of the House crossed over and began felicitations to bring about a successful termination of the matter at issue. I thought, sir, that this whole assembly might well rise and sing, "Blest be the tie that binds."

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. J. S. McKINNON: And, sir, upon that tie, while those two distinguished gentlemen of this assembly were sitting together, it did occur to me that if they sat closely enough together, probably the other two mem-

ponent parts of this assembly, referred to by the Hon. Mackenzie King, might have found room beside them—namely, labour, capital, management, and the community.

We have listened, Mr. Chairman, with a great deal of pleasure to the addresses that have been delivered; but, sir, for argument, for logic, and for common-sense I commend to this assembly the masterly address delivered by Mr. Melville White, of Toronto, in opening the discussion upon our side. The arguments contained in that address have not yet, I think, fully sunk into this assembly, and I believe also that in other gatherings of this kind that address will form a text that will be largely used not only in the United States but in other countries of the civilized world where meetings and assemblies of this kind are being held. We have not yet, Mr. Chairman, reached the full conclusion and benefit of the work that Mr. White has placed before us.

It has been said with a wave of the hand, by some of the gentlemen and ladies opposite, that statistics are not necessary. How can we get away from statistics in matters of this kind? How can we get away from economic conditions? It is all right to talk about shorter hours of labour, and there is not a man here on this side of the House but will concede as short hours as it is possible for the industries of this country to give. But, Sir, we have a national debt. We have to pay the cost of the war. We have to pay the pensions to which we are committed. And it is impossible, Sir, to deal with a question of this kind without taking into consideration the statistics presented by our good friend Mr. White.

I was particularly interested, Mr. Chairman, in the addresses of some of the members opposite yesterday, and I should like to point out to you some things that were contained in those addresses.

One of the speakers referred to the 8-hour day as not at all what was in the minds of the workers, saying that it was a compromise, and that before long you, Sir, if you thought fit, might in your wisdom ask this assemblage not to discuss an 8-hour day, but to discuss something entirely different. Therefore it appears to many of us that we ought to know whether we are really and fundamentally discussing a wage problem or an 8-hour day.

Another matter, Sir, to which I should like to call your attention is a term with which I am not very familiar, but which has been sent broadcast from one part of this country to the other. It seems to me, Sir, a somewhat dangerous term, and probably a little more light might well be thrown upon it. I refer to the term "conscription of wealth," a term that I think was slightly out of place where it was used.

The third matter is one which was referred to by another speaker. You, Sir, have asked us to come here to discuss this matter. We are honest men, trying to discuss this in an honest way. But on the other side of the House what did we find? A threat hurled across the floor of this Chamber that if this 8-hour day were not adopted in this country the industries of this country would be paralyzed and turmoil would reign supreme. That, Sir, in view of the fact that you have asked us to come here to discuss this matter, is getting a little ahead of the game.

This 8-hour day, and working down to six hours, or down to any possible number of hours, is a serious business. It seems to me that probably the ideal condition would be that no man would need to work but should continue to receive his daily income. So far we have found considerable difficulty in imitating the insects of the field, who can live in columns of silver, awake in the morning to quench their thirst with a dewdrop, and turning down the bedcovers eat their resting-place. There are in this country experiments being made with the 8-hour day, both as to piece-work and the week-work system; and I contend, Sir, that it is a time to go slow, as is mentioned in the report of the commission—a time to feel our way. We, the employers on this side, are willing to do everything for our employees; we are willing to give a fair deal and more than a fair deal in every particular. So, gentlemen, I appeal to you through the Chairman to let us approach this question in a spirit of fairness and squareness, and though we may be divided upon this question we all believe in Him who brought peace and good-will. If we are true to His teaching, if we listen to the voice of conscience, if we are willing to give and take, and make due allowance for the passions, nay, the prejudices of others, I have not lost hope for the future of this great Dominion or the good that can be accomplished by this great assembly.

Mr. J. A. McCLELLAND (Montreal): Mr. Chairman, when we started this discussion, when the motion to send the matter to the committee was made, it was thought that sufficient light had not been thrown on the question. I think most of the delegates here will agree that we have

had considerable light thrown upon it, and I rise to move that the subject-matter of the discussion be committed to the committee appointed to deal with this matter.

In doing so, however, I should like to make a reference to what the last speaker said as to a threat, as he claimed, that was made across the floor of this House yesterday. A statement was made, not a threat, Mr. Chairman, and the statement was made in view of the fact that 47 per cent of over 500,000 workers in Canada are working 48 hours or less, which will almost assuredly cause dissatisfaction, probably to the extent to which the gentleman on this side of the House has referred.

Considerable reference has been made to British fair play. I think we have given evidence during our argument that we have that one thing continuously before our minds.

I have here some figures taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, which I will quote.

Mr. M. P. WHITE (Toronto): Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. Is this not the leader of the other side in the debate on this question? This discussion is not yet completed. Is he not out of order in rising until he is ready to wind up the question? We on our side are not yet finished.

Mr. McCLELLAND: Mr. Chairman, I am winding up the debate for this side of the House. I have no control whatever of the opposite side; they can continue the debate for the remainder of the day, so far as I am personally concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that satisfactory?

Mr. M. P. WHITE: Oh, yes.

Mr. McCLELLAND: These figures are taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and give a total value of manufactured products in Canada of $3,815,586,869; cost of raw material, $802,133,862; wages of 619,473 wage earners, $477,945,456; salaries of 73,598 workers, $95,983,506; value added by labour over wages and salaries, $2,440,144,043. These figures give a capital investment of $2,772,519,680; interest of 10 per cent on the investment, $277,251,968; overhead charges, $322,754,542; leaving a net surplus to the employers of $1,840,137,533.

An EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE: Who has got it?

Mr. TOM MOORE: You have it over there.

Mr. McCLELLAND: The workers' share per head of that is set at $772.

Some things have been said about the markets to which our surplus products must be exported. It has been shown on this side of the House, I contend, that, regardless of that, the countries to which we are exporting have adopted the hours that we are attempting to gain here, or at least are within a very short distance of it. They have, if not the 44-hour, at least the 48-hour week.

Reference has been made in some of the addresses to the patriotic standpoint from which this question ought to be viewed. We are extremely anxious that the employers should view it from that standpoint, and should try if possible to level up the amounts received by labour and the returns received by capital from the manufactured products of this country.

France and Great Britain are providing for the 8-hour day and all of the War Labour Board decisions in the United States are based on the 8-hour day—I think I am correct in saying that—the 48-hour week. Some of the houses in the city of Toronto are now working the 44-hour week. I think they are piano furnishings or general merchandise stores. The Holdstein house in Toronto, I am given to understand, employs 400 employees, and is now working a 48-hour week, eight hours per day for five days, and it is evidently perfectly satisfied with the results obtained.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been said that the argument on this side of the House has been conducted largely from the standpoint of conditions in Great Britain, and the inference has been that we are in another country and should not take our standards from any country but this in which we live. I wonder if it would be interesting to any manufacturing friends to know that the product per unit in America is from 2½ to 3 per cent greater than in Great Britain. This has been proved, and information is to be found on the subject in a standard work by Turner—which can be had and questioned by those who wish to question it.

I think, Mr. Chairman, in the face of all the evidence that has been adduced by this side of the House in support of their claim, that the matter has reached the state where it can be very safely sent to the committee for their report, and I so move.

Col. THOMAS CANTLEY (New Glasgow, N. S.): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: Many of the speakers on both sides

of the Chamber have thought it necessary to refer to the early age at which they entered their life's struggle, the lowest age yet claimed being eleven years. I will not detain you with any data as to my youthful experience, and my autobiography has not yet been written. Some of my early life history is known to my good friend Premier Murray, who with two members of his Cabinet are now with us. I only hope Premier Murray will not tell all he knows of me.

For a matter of sixteen years, I had the privilege of leading an industrial army of from eight to ten or perhaps twelve thousand men. On the matter of hours of labour I have an open mind, as evidenced by the fact that at different times and under differing circumstances we have worked gangs in four shifts of six hours, three shifts of eight hours, and two shifts of eleven and thirteen hours. The reason being that the character of the labour differed. In forging hammered car axles, which is perhaps the hardest and the hottest manual labour that I know of, six hours is about as much as can be successfully worked; and the largest continuous daily output in my experience has been obtained from four shifts working six hours each.

The question of hours depends, in my judgment, largely upon such considerations. Various considerations are involved in this whole question of hours. One of them is: can we afford it? Mr. Lloyd George, who, as we all know, for many years took a very deep interest in all social questions and matters of this kind, recently made the statement that, as a result of the lessening of the hours of labour within recent years, it had been demonstrated that the output bore an exact mathematical relation to the reduction of hours. He made the statement that a recent analysis of the facts led him to the conclusion that he was wrong in the view that he had formerly taken in regard to the effect of a reduction of hours of work as it affected output.

During the last four years we have had an era of great apparent prosperity in this country—I repeat, apparent prosperity—and we are now face to face with a condition and situation such as we have not experienced in the past. I illustrate that by saying that the cost of all our basic materials has undergone an enormous change. The cost of coal in eastern Canada, in Nova Scotia, is more than double what it was in pre-war days; the cost of coke has increased 218 per cent; the cost of pig iron has increased 266 per cent; and the cost of producing steel ingots has increased 273 per cent. Now, gentlemen, these are figures that cannot successfully be controverted. I am speaking by the book, and the figures are open to examination, and have indeed been examined by officers appointed by my friend on the platform here (Mr. C. A. Macgrath), who so ably carried on the fuel control of this country in a time when it was a matter of very grave doubt if we would be able to carry on so far as fuel was concerned. As a matter of fact, so high have these costs become that to-day in Cape Breton not a ton of pig iron or of steel ingots is being produced. Why is that? It is because neither the domestic nor any foreign market will pay the cost, to say nothing of any profits to the industry.

We are not in a position either to export that material to the consuming centres of the world or use it in this country, and present costs will have to be reduced before we are able to do so. Now, that is a serious situation. Can we improve it by shortening the hours of labour? I only ask the question.

Another question comes up as to the present efficiency of labour under shorter hours. In certain respects, and in regard to certain kinds of businesses, yes; in regard to others, no. My judgment following an experience extending over a period of 35 years, is this, that 20 years ago, 15 years ago, 25 years ago, so far as ordinary labour was concerned—I am not speaking now of skilled labour, or labour in connection with automatic machinery, but of the ordinary unskilled labour of the country—we were getting from 20 men as much service as we are getting to-day from 25 or 30 men. That is my deliberate opinion; it is only an opinion; and I may be wrong; for I am often wrong; but in regard to that matter I fancy I am not.

Reference has been made to the results following shorter hours and the possibility in connection with shorter hours in certain industries; and as illustrating that point my friend Colonel Carnegie has referred to the experience of Sir Robert Hadfield and his firm. Reference has also been made to Ford and some others. Now, I would like to say, so far as the Hadfield firm is concerned, that they had an absolute monopoly protected by patents over a period of years; their product had no competitor; they were able practically to control the whole market in that line. What they really did was not so much to give

the shorter hour as to establish piece-work, which in some respects means the same thing. Another gentleman, in the cement trade, referred elsewhere to the fact that he had given his men 9 hours, and he proceeded to say: "What I told them was that if they kept their rock-bin filled I would give them a 9-hour day." What he really did was to put them on piece-work, and if the men had filled their rock-bin in 8 hours or 7 hours, or 6 hours, that was what he wanted. It was piece-work, not a 9-hour day. When you get down to the facts you find that Hadfield or Ford or Lord Leverhulme have a monopoly by reason of patents or some secret process, or something else not common to other lines; so that these cases do not apply; that is the point.

With regard to the railway situation, owing to the McAdoo award the increased wages paid on the Canadian National Railway system this year will exceed that paid last year to the same number of men by approximately $20,000,000. If we take the three great railway systems—Canadian National, the Grand Trunk, and the Canadian Pacific—the increased wages paid this year over last year will practically aggregate one hundred millions of dollars, possibly a little more. Where is that spread? We have practically 8,000,000 people in Canada; say 8,200,000, of whom 200,000 are engaged in railway work. The 8,000,000 have to absorb that $100,000,000, which is equivalent to $5 per month for every family in Canada, assuming five people to a family. Now, take the receipts and outgoings of the Canadian National system for the first six months of this year. The gross receipts exceeded those of the same period last year by about $7,500,000; the outgoings, largely labour, amounted to $8,500,000, more than the total receipts. The increased receipts of $7,500,000 were largely made up of increase in freight rates—not in increase in freight carried, for the total tonnage did not increase over that of last year to any appreciable extent. The passenger business increased, because they were carrying to the West a large number of returned soldiers, and as a matter of fact the pleasure travel to-day is greater by far than it ever was before in this country. But, so far as purely mercantile traffic is concerned, there was relatively no increase, though, in fact in one month there was a very decided increase, aggregating over 400,000 tons.

In my opinion an 8-hour day all over Canada for all industry is not now possible. You will ask me what those figures in regard to increased cost of railway operation and other increased costs have to do with the question. They have this to do with it. In view of our present tremendous responsibilities—the great amount of money that has to be raised in this country for not a few years to come—can we afford it? I simply put the question to you. Each of us must answer it as best he can in his own way, in the light of all the information we can obtain, and in fairness to the prosperity and progress of our common country.

Mr. S. R. PARSONS (Toronto): Ladies and gentlemen and fellow workers, having worked for fifty years of my life, and expecting to work good and hard for the balance, I think I am entitled to call any one who works, a fellow worker, and I am glad to be able to do it. There was distributed to the members of this House yesterday a memorandum containing particulars of proposed Bills which are to be brought into the British House of Commons covering minimum wages and the 8-hour day. In the memorandum which has been prepared by the Government of this country, setting forth some particulars in those proposed Bills I notice, in connection with the 8-hour Bill the following statement on page 2:

> This Bill proposes something which is little short of a revolution in British industrial life.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if the Government of this country characterizes a Bill which is to come before the British House of Commons as somewhat revolutionary, what will the Government of this country, let alone the people, employers and others, say of a proposition which is before this House to-day for the introduction of a 44-hour week Bill? I understand that that is what our friends on the opposite side propose. If the Government thinks that a 48-hour Bill in Great Britain, with different conditions, is somewhat revolutionary, what will they say of a 44-hour Bill under the present conditions which we are facing in the Dominion of Canada? I think this is a point to which the attention of all should be drawn, and which we should consider most seriously. In this connection I would like to ask the Chairman whether the figures which were supplied yesterday were based on a 44-hour week or a 48-hour week.

The CHAIRMAN: In reply to the speaker's question, as far as I know, the figures were based on the number of hours per day. I assume they include the 8-hour day where it applied, and the 48-hour week.

and the 44-hour week where they applied. I presume the figures included both.

Mr. PARSONS: We have heard many statistics, not only from the other side of the House, but from this side. They sometimes remind us of people who go to the good old book for guidance as to the course they are going to take—with their minds made up—and then they find a verse that substantiates their views. They remind us also of what Lord Balfour said in the British House some years ago: "Gentlemen, there are three kinds of lies; first of all, just ordinary, everyday, common lies; in the next place, thundering big lies; and, in the third place, statistics. We may make statistics go on all fours to cover almost any point we have in mind; but, gentlemen, if we use our common sense, if we look around and see conditions as they are in Canada to-day, if we realize what we have to face as a nation, and if at the same time we think of the good of the workers and the individual, we will be somewhat sobered and ready to talk together in conference.

I am particularly glad that we have this conference. There is not a no-man's land between us, but together we are considering the national problems as well as individual problems which this country has to face. My own relationships with labour, in the business in which I am engaged, as well as on the Labour Appeal Board with officials of labour, and in other directions, throughout many years have been of the most satisfactory character, and I believe that all that is required is for us to sit together face to face and look into these questions from every possible angle and variant, and I am quite satisfied that the ladies and gentlemen on the opposite side of the House will finally agree with those on this side in measures which are for the common good. After all, we must realize that each one of us is simply, and honestly, I believe, looking for that which will benefit the greatest number. I cannot accept the view that all on the one side are selfish and all on the other side are unselfish. I am sure that that sort of a doctrine will never prevail in Canada. Let us think the best of each other, and as we sit together in conference let us see if we cannot find some common ground on which we may all agree. It has seemed to me, from some of the utterances made by our friends on the opposite side, that they had an idea that all they had to do was to extract from the employers of labour some special concessions which might benefit them as a whole. Let us realize that the first consideration is a national consideration; and I am prepared to say that I believe that those sitting opposite, if they once have the facts placed before them, are as ready to believe that as we who are on this side of the House. Our common interests are of such a nature that we can well afford to sink that which is purely selfish, and we ought to do it, particularly at this time, in the interests of the nation. I would like to read a short statement which is an expression of the Midvale Steel workers at Atlantic City, which we are told is "the sanest expression of labour in many months"—the announcement of the unanimous adoption of resolutions by the elected representatives of the employees of the Midvale Steel and Ordnance Company, Cambria Steel Company, and subsidiary companies, assembled in conference in Atlantic City. I will just read one or two paragraphs:

> Whereas, the price of commodities is regulated by the day's labour of a man, and the real unit of value or the unit of compensation is not a dollar but the purchasing price of a dollar, and that the price of all things, meaning the average price of everything we use and consume, which is commonly referred to as the average price of commodities, is fixed, regulated, raised or lowered by the average compensation received for one hour's work by every man and every woman; and....
>
> Resolved, that persistent and unceasing demand of workmen employed in all classes and kinds of industries for a shorter day's work and an increased wage in order to meet the present high cost of living is uneconomic and unwise and should not be encouraged.

That, gentlemen, is the declaration of the workers connected with those industries which I have mentioned.

Now, as to the hours of work, I think my friend Colonel Cantley has put before us what we all agree with on both sides of the House. It is utterly impossible in this great country, where we have large farming interests, where practically one-half of the people are engaged in farming, and where we have extensive lumbering, fishing, and mining occupations, to set forth a working day of certain stated hours and make it apply to all classes of industry. To my mind it would simply paralyze the country altogether. I have, however, the greatest possible sympathy for those who work and toil in positions that are exacting, and which destroy manhood and womanhood. I do not care if in those industries we should make the time four hours a day, provided we could raise our national revenue and do our business in competition with other nations of the world; but I think that the hours of labour should be regulated

by the exigencies of the situation, and also by the class of industry which is represented. In some industries men can work for long hours, in others for only short hours; and when we begin to legislate and definitely set a time for every industry in the country, I think we are making a very great mistake. Even the Peace Conference, you remember, stated this:

> They recognize that differences of climate, habits and customs, of economic opportunity and industrial tradition, make strict uniformity in the conditions of labour difficult of immediate attainment.

There was a little talk on the other side of the House yesterday about privilege. Well, gentlemen, it appears to me that in this country we should not begin to talk about privilege. Most of us were not born with silver spoons in our mouths; we have had to toil early and late; and very largely the difference between the successful man of to-day and the unsuccessful man is that the one worked early and late without regard to hours, was thrifty and saving, and got ahead, and invested his savings as profitably as he could. That opportunity is open to very man; was never more open than it is to-day. There is no such thing as privilege in this country. We are all privileged, every one of us, in a country like Canada.

Something was said by our lady friend—whom I, too, would like to compliment for her splendid address—about there being no bankruptcy in Vancouver. Why should there be bankruptcy in Vancouver? If there were bankruptcy in Vancouver, there would be bankruptcy all over the country, and the first to suffer would be those who are the least able to stand it. We must realize this, that in order to obtain national revenues success must be had in the different industries of this country; otherwise, they are of no use whatever either to the employers or the employees, or to the country. This unwise, foolish talk which has been going on in some of our church courts, to the effect that competition and profit should be done away with in favour of co-operation and service, is to my mind the worst kind of doctrine that could be preached.

I do not remember who it was that said something yesterday about the great Victory Loans and their drain upon the country. Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to say to you that throughout this country many of the industrial workers invested in those Victory Loans. It is one of the grandest things that ever occurred in Canada. In my own little works every single employee—most of them helped by the company—invested in Victory Loans. Do you think that the interest on these loans should be withheld from their savings? Not at all. They certainly have a right to it. And so throughout this entire country, a very large proportion of our Victory Loans are owned by the people who ought to own them, the great industrial classes, who have been able out of hard earned savings to invest in good securities.

One word more. What do we face to-day? One hundred millions of people in Europe on the verge of starvation. Not one-third of all the industries of Europe are to-day producing and fully efficient. What does that mean? Did ever such an opportunity occur for Canadians to do their utmost as there is before us to-day? Production—people are crying out for it all over the world. If we would forget our little differences in the meantime, and get down to good, hard work, this country would progress in the next few months or in the next year or two as it never progressed before.

Ladies and gentlemen, there is one thing which we have perhaps failed to recognize. If I read the signs of the times aright, there is another element coming into our disputes, and one to which we have not perhaps given attention—one that has been quiescent up till the present time. It is the great public. This is the way it occurs to me. If there are selfish employers who forget their duty to their men and will not do that which is fair and reasonable and right, and if there are selfish employees, those who do not put in a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, the great public is going to take those two classes by the scruff of the neck and bang their heads together and ask them to get to work. That is my opinion about it.

It seems to me that this Conference is just about one year too early. In view of the conditions in Europe, in view of the fact that Great Britain has not legislated, that the United States has not legislated, I think that Canada, with her small and scattered population, with her struggling industries in many cases, would be very unwise at this particular moment to tie her hands—in the interest of employees just as much as in the interest of employers; that if we in conference could get together and say we will put aside our differences in the meantime, for perhaps a year, until we can see how the world is coming out, and what we are doing to meet the conditions that are abroad, in our own interest as well as in

the interest of the great world, we could meet again in a year from now and could get together and do that which would be in the interest of all classes of the community.

Mr. E. W. A. O'DELL (Hamilton): I desire to second Mr. McClelland's motion, in view of the fact that there are many other important matters on the agenda. While we have many who are desirous of speaking on this question, we are willing to forego that in order to expedite business.

The CHAIRMAN: There is before the Chair a motion which I think ought to be acted upon. It has been moved and seconded that we now close the debate and refer the subject-matter under consideration to the appropriate committee. I do not like to close off debate; in fact, I think I am responsible for the discussion having been greatly extended yesterday; but now it is more than 24 hours since we decided to continue discussion on this particular subject, and, inasmuch as there are a number of other matters on the agenda to be given attention, I do feel that the discussion on this question should be concluded. I therefore propose to put the motion that item No. 2 of the revised agenda be referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. J. R. SHAW: Mr. Chairman, has not the gentleman who led in the presentation of the employers' views the right to make a reply?

The CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Shaw's observation is probably sound and in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on Arrangements. With the consent of the mover and seconder, Mr. White will have the privilege of replying.

Mr. E. W. A. O'DELL: I think that is only fair, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MELVILLE P. WHITE (Toronto): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I still maintain, as I did yesterday, that we must learn to speak in terms of national interest, and not the interest of a particular class or a particular industry. I was glad yesterday when the young lady speaker called attention to the pessimism which ran through my statement. I have discovered in everything that I have found in reference to the problems which are worrying and bothering the different countries of the world that same spirit of pessimism everywhere. It is not because it should be there, but because those who have the responsibility for solving the problems despair of getting at a solution, owing to the peculiar influences which tend to hold the two sides at a deadlock. They do not know how they are to overcome the difficulty. The workers' side to the controversy does not believe that the problem should be solved upon an economic basis. The workers are determined that the problem should be solved on a social basis. We must recognize the rights of the social basis, but I am as sure as I can possibly be that the economic basis, for the present, comes first. We shall have no social basis to deal with, that is worth looking at; if we allow the economic situation to be depressed and disturbed until we have suffering, starvation, and misery and all those things which come out of a bad economic condition.

I would like to quote, in order to justify my impression of pessimism, some statements in the way of evidence. I think there is, perhaps, no greater authority on the subject than the man whose name has been used a number of times here, Mr. David Lloyd George, the Premier of Great Britain, and I think it would be well to carry away with us, before we settle this matter, his exact statement regarding it, because we ought to recognize him as a great authority. I have here his words. It will take only a minute to read them:

> What are the facts? There is a sensational decrease in output. The output is less than ever, and that is true of every branch of production except agriculture, where you have had an increase during the war. I have inquired in every direction, and the output is sensibly diminished in every branch of industry. We are spending more, we are earning less, we are consuming more, we are producing less. These are the facts of the situation and it cannot last

Referring to coal, he said:

> The fact is we are not producing or handling as much per man as we were producing and handling on August 4, 1914. This reduction in output is the outstanding feature of the moment. Let me examine the reasons for diminished production because unless you get at the cause of the diminished production you cannot find the remedy. It is true that hours of labour also have been reduced. One of the arguments for the reduction of hours of labour that I have heard in this House for the last 20 or 30 years was that you would not have less production, but on the contrary you might increase it and you would certainly improve its quality. I have heard it many a time when I used to vote for the Eight-hour Bill for miners, and I have heard it on the seven-hour movement, and I have heard it whenever there was any discussion on the reduction of hours; but unfortunately the fact is that with that substantial reduction in the hours of labour you have a reduction in output in mathematical proportion to the diminution in the number of hours.

My contentions of yesterday were largely based upon the reduction of hours below

50 per week. I believe absolutely that it is in many industries possible to reduce the long hours that have been worked in England, and in many cases to maintain the output, and that in others it is very difficult. The all-important question at this stage of the game is, can the hours be reduced at this time? It is the day and the hour and the moment that we must consider in reference to the interests of the people of Canada. I would like also to quote, if I might, a statement of the Minister of Labour of Great Britain, made on July 29, which was spread over England very extensively. He says:

Any man who is unprepared to put forth an effort even greater than that he made during the war mocks the dead he professes to glorify. They died to preserve their country. If men are unwilling to exert all their power in peaceful production and honest toil, the country will be ruined as irretrievably as if the Hun had invaded it and spread his devastating hand over it.

No class is free from criticism. Many manufacturers are profiteering at the expense of the community. Many workmen are refusing to give an adequate day's work for the service of the country. As a result of these two factors Britain is becoming impoverished. Unless there is a great awakening this nation, which has proved its courage and capacity for sacrifice, will go down to disaster through failure to use victory wisely.

Far better in such a case would it have been to have been beaten on the field of battle and to have returned with a chastened spirit to retrieve our fortune by persistent toil. At the present time our production of almost all that is essential for the continuance of the country's success has reached a dangerously low level. The output of that prime necessity coal is imperilling every industry we possess.

It is the duty of every right thinking citizen to be a missionary preaching the gospel that in work alone lies safety. It should be the pride of every one to bear this banner in this new crusade.

I would like to quote also a statement which is issued in the Quarterly Report of the General Federation of Trades Unions of Great Britain:

November, 1919, to May, 1920, will be fateful months. Unless sanity returns and production increase they will be tragic months. Strikes have been precipitated which might have been avoided and union funds have been needlessly dissipated. Some strikes had a distinctly political origin. Political strikes must either fail or end in revolution. They are not against the capitalists, but against the community. It is not the capitalist who suffers, but the people. Against such strikes the Government must protect the people or surrender its functions. The effect of such strikes is to decrease production and increase the price of all commodities.

"In view of the national situation and the prevalence of a great shortage, it is imperative that trades unions face the facts. The outstanding ones are that the war is over; that competitive laws, as between nations, are now fully operating; that food and raw materials required for the subsistence of Great Britain must be bought from countries over whose merchants our Government has no control, and that commodities must be paid for with goods, not paper.

I have also a statement issued by the American Federation of Labour, suggesting the same thing, that production, after all, has to be the basis on which we rest the efforts for the immediate future.

I am just as much interested in the desire to solve the social problem as the economic problem. I think that in all my work in connection with this matter I have tried to get at and to see the true solution of the whole problem for the benefit of all concerned. I have not uttered a single syllable here which I meant to be in the interest of the gentlemen on this side of the House. My words are all in the interest of the whole people of Canada, and I ask that the Conference consider the thing in that light. It surely cannot be possible that all this evidence which I have tried to give is the evidence of those who are blind or short-sighted and cannot see to the problems. I would like to have a line-up of the authorities who are behind these ideas and these statements—for I am only reflecting statements that have been gathered together—to see whether they are sufficiently intelligent men for us to place some credence, at least, in the statements which they make. And they are in every country—Italy and France and Great Britain and the United States, and also Canada. I leave that thought with you.

I could say a good deal about the misconception that prevails. One gentleman spoke about the distribution of capital. I only wish that we had some one, not on our side, but some one who is independent, perhaps belonging to the Third Group or to the Government, who could enlarge on the element of capital— how it applies to industries, and where the profits go—in order to eliminate so much misconception. I do not believe the employers themselves know much more than the workmen about what capital is. But I would just like to point out one illustration. Take a country which has had rapid development, like the United States. Take it as it was forty or fifty years ago, after the Civil War. Its great industries have been developed since that time; they have spread out over the whole country. Some corporations and some individuals gathered huge amounts of money, and there are people who would like to see this money taken and distributed among the workers. I would like them to follow that money and find where it h...

gone, and what has been done with it. Call it profits or profiteering or anything you like. That money is all invested, every single dollar of it, in some industry somewhere. It helps to enlarge the industry, to take care of the population of the country; and at the same time that industry was increasing, capital was also increasing. The two things are so intimately related that they cannot go without one another. If you were to take Mr. Carnegie's money or Mr. Rockfeller's money away from him and distribute it among people somewhere else, you would have to go and shut up his works and his industries where his money is working; don't forget that. If you were to take all the profits away from the people who have made profits in Canada during the war and were to distribute them pro rata among the people of Canada, each would receive such a small amount that no one would obtain any material benefit from it; and if you did so, you would be taking away that capital which is necessary for the development of the future, the thing that we are talking about. We have not enough industry to supply the future demand. Where are we going to get it if we do not take our savings, whether they are profits or whatever they are, and put them back into industry. You cannot keep money out of industry. It cannot be done. There is not a man in a shop or anywhere who puts money in the bank that does not put it into industry. What does the bank do with it? It pays him three per cent, and the next morning someone comes along to borrow the money, and it is put into someone's shop or helps to pay someone's wage-bill to produce something, and it is then spent in something which is produced, and perhaps goes back to the bank, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not desire to interrupt the speaker if it is the wish of the Conference that he should proceed; but I would point out that he is not exactly in order, but is proceeding with argument which I think is hardly proper, especially as he has exceeded his time.

Is the Conference now ready to deal with the motion, which has been made and seconded, that this subject be now referred to the Committee?

The motion was agreed to.

VISITORS FROM ABROAD.

GREETINGS AND ADDRESSES.

The CHAIRMAN: May I at this point observe that this Conference is regarded with great interest, not only throughout our own country but in other countries, particularly those industrially important. There arrived here yesterday afternoon another gentleman from England who is deeply interested in the subject with which we are dealing. If time permits, I think we should be very glad to hear from Mr. H. B. Butler, of the British Ministry of Labour. He, as you probably know, is Provisional Secretary of the International Conference that is to meet in Washington next month.

In addition to Mr. Butler, there are two other gentlemen from the great Republic to the south—Ernest T. Trigg, President of the National Federation of Construction Industries, and Director of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and Mr. John C. Frazee, Secretary of the National Federation of Construction Industries.

We are glad to welcome all these gentlemen to a seat at this Conference, and hope that the time they spend with us will not have been misspent.

Mr. E. W. A. O'DELL (Hamilton): Mr. Chairman, as we have only a short time before adjourning, and cannot complete the discussion of the third item on the agenda, I would suggest that if the speakers are ready we hear them now.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the suggestion is opportune, inasmuch as there are only about thirty minutes between now and the adjournment, that the Conference hear from the gentlemen I have just mentioned.

I also notice in the audience Hon. Mr. Crothers, and would ask him if he would kindly come forward and take a seat.

Is it the will of the Conference to concur in the suggestion which has been made?

Some DELEGATES: Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: I will ask Mr. Butler to be good enough to address you.

Mr. H. B. BUTLER: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, you have taken me rather by surprise. I did not come here with the intention of making a speech, and made no preparations for it. I came here to listen, and I feel that my time has been thoroughly well spent. I have heard you discussing problems which we have been discussing, and I think the difficulties which confront you are in a very large measure the same difficulties that are confronting us. I am not going to enter into a discussion of any of the subjects which I have heard discussed here, because I realize that Canadian conditions

are entirely different from British conditions, and that what may be suitable in our country may not be suitable in yours. What I should like to do, if I may, is to say one or two words about the International Labour Conference which is to take place in Washington next month.

That Conference is a matter of interest to all countries. The Conference is taking place by virtue of the labour section of the Peace Treaty, by which it is sought to establish a permanent organization for the discussion and settlement of labour questions on an international basis. In the course of the discussion to which I listened yesterday several references were made to conditions in other countries. It was suggested that the 48-hour week might be difficult of accomplishment here, because in other countries they were working longer hours or were working under conditions which made their competition difficult for you to meet. Those are just the kind of problems that have to be thrashed out at Washington. It was suggested that in Germany, for instance, they are working more than eight hours a day. If that is so, then an international gathering is the place to get at the truth, and to arrive at some general agreement which will enable some kind of international standardization to be established. I think all the industrial countries which took part in the discussion in Paris felt that unless some effort of that kind was made, it would be impossible for labour conditions to be improved throughout the world with the rapidity with which they ought to be improved. The fear of foreign competition cannot be eliminated except by common action, and it was in order to create a basis for common action that the labour section of the Treaty provided for this international organization. Of course, the whole thing is going to be a big experiment. For the first time we shall have representatives of the Government, representatives of the employers, and representatives of the workers, sitting side by side in a gathering of this kind; but I feel that something is going to come of it, something that is going to be of real use to the world, and something which is going to mean a piece of work for the League of Nations with which the organization is linked up. When that Conference takes place, I am sure Canada will be able to make her voice heard, all the more by reason of this Conference which is now taking place here, and I shall look forward to meeting later on at Washington many of the gentlemen whom I have met here.

Hon. Mr. Robertson left the Chair, his place being taken by Mr. C. A. Magrath.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Tripp has been mentioned. Will he kindly address the Conference now?

Mr. ERNEST T. TRIPP: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am here in the capacity of a listener deeply interested in all your proceedings. The problems which you are discussing are the problems which are meeting us in the United States. As I am sure you all know, our President has called a Conference, to be held early in October, which will be composed in a way very similar to the way in which this one is made up, and at which the important subject of the relations between the employer and the employee, or between capital and labour, will be discussed, and we hope satisfactorily arranged.

There is nothing, it seems to me, quite so important in the world to-day as the question of getting a little closer together, each side understanding the problems and difficulties of the other, and dealing with them in a constructive way, instead of viewing them from the standpoint of preconceived conclusions.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, if I may, to congratulate this meeting on the manner in which your discussions have been carried on, on the fairness of expression and attitude displayed on both sides, a spirit which it seems to me is bound to produce the best kind of results. I am going back home very much better for the privilege of having been here and listening to your discussions, and I believe that the work which you are initiating in this way will not only be very beneficial to you in this country, but will set the pace for clearing up the atmosphere elsewhere as well. I thank you for the privilege of being here.

The CHAIRMAN: Is Mr. Frazer present?

Mr. JOHN C. FRAZER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the questions which you are discussing here are of special interest to me. Throughout the period of the war I was identified with the United States Department of Labour, and, while I perhaps knew less about questions of labour at the beginning of the war than I should have known, during that period I learned to know a great many labour men, not only of Pennsylvania, but of other parts of the country, and as a result of that I have something of a background of experience which causes this Conference to be of exceeding interest to me.

It seems to me that the most outstanding feature of this Conference is the fact

that you are together, and, so far as I was able to learn yesterday afternoon, there is a spirit of absolute harmony. You are seeking to understand each other, and if you are able to carry on your Conference with a real and sincere desire to understand each other, perhaps each of you, realizing that at the present time there are some phases of the other man's point of view that you do not understand. I think you may consider that the Conference is the initial step in a new era in the history of Canada—and in the history of the world, if you please.

Mr. Stone was absolutely right the other day when he said that the time had come to put the word "brother" back into "brotherhood." We are not so far removed from each other as we sometimes imagine. I am at the present time with the Employers' group. My father ran a machine shop when I was a boy, and I learned the machinist's trade, and before I undertook to work my way through college I went down to the college town where I expected to go through college and worked as a railroad machinist. Many of the men over on the employers' side of the House started out, as they testified yesterday, working at some trade, and many of you gentlemen on the other side, and those whom you represent, in the course of a few years are going to sit on the other side.

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. J. C. FRAZEE: There are some of you gentlemen who are gradually going to get into the contracting business or some other line of work, and you are going to begin to hire some one else to work for you, and are going to drift imperceptibly from the employed to the employer. For a time you are going to work with your employees: you are going to hire one man and work with him. I had my house painted the other day, and the employer and the employed stood side by side on ladders painting that house. There is not a no-man's land between you gentlemen, although a few of us sit in between. There is not a no-man's land. There is an opportunity for you, if you achieve nothing else at this Conference, to take the first step, and a very important step, in getting together.

As I heard one gentleman say a little while ago, the workingman is the public. I grant you that the workingman is part of the public; the employers are part of the public; the farmers are part of the public, and the wives and women of all of us are a part of the public.

You have a magnificent Dominion here. I must declare that I am astonished that a few million people have been able to carve out of this great north the Dominion that you have. It is positively astounding. I think you are even more efficient than we are down south. Now, the efficiency, the measure of your achievement, gentlemen, is whether you are going to stand side by side on the ladder as you climb up in history.

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not suppose that it is the intention that we should take up the third item now. Therefore we stand adjourned.

The Conference adjourned at 12.15.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Conference resumed at 2.30 p.m. Hon. Senator Robertson presiding.

MINIMUM WAGE LAWS.

DISCUSSION—QUESTION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE.

The CHAIRMAN: The next item of business on the agenda is the consideration of Item 3 of the revised agenda: "Consideration of minimum wage laws." I think that without further preliminaries we may proceed at once to the consideration of this question, if the gentlemen in charge of it are prepared to go on.

Mr. TOM MOORE: I understood that, by arrangement yesterday, or by acceptance of Mr. Shaw, the employers' side were perfectly satisfied to alternate in the presentation of clauses, and I understood that Mr. Grier was to introduce this subject.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER (Toronto): No, we started the last.

Mr. MOORE: No, Mr. McClelland started the last.

Mr. GRIER: I must apologize; I understood we had begun the last. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the original speaker is allotted to the extent of thirty minutes; but as I do not expect to occupy that time fully, I think it would not be altogether out of place to make one or two observations of a more or less personal character.

In the first place, I should like to say generally that I very much appreciate the spirit, largely speaking, in which these matters which have come before us have been approached, not only by those who

are on this side of the House, but also by those who are on the other side.

As for myself, I have no quarrel with those who have thought it fitting, speaking either from that side or from this, to make one or two somewhat intimate references to myself. I have felt that they have been made in the kindliest possible spirit, and on that account I have no quarrel. I am free to say that when I recall the circumstance, now alluded to more than once, in the early morning hour at which, habited in pyjamas, I was in a certain portion of a certain railway system, I had not supposed that it would come up for remark in public, and most especially did I not imagine that it would ever be an occasion for a reference to hymnology of any sort; and had any particular hymn been suggested to me, who was then in his second railway accident, I should have suggested, "Oft in danger, oft in woe," rather than "Blest be the tie that binds." I am free to say this, however, that I was glad to have that reference made, because it permits of my going on to remark that upon that occasion, as upon that of an earlier accident in which I was, with others, the subject of derailment and upsetting down an embankment, it was most forcibly proved that Shakespeare was right when he wrote that "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin." Upon both of those occasions the sympathy of mankind was most beautifully shown, so that it matters not from what part of the country or in what conditions of life any passenger had up to that time lived, the sympathy throughout was the same. But, lest you might think that I am recalling any action upon my own part, let me add—those who are interested in psychology may perhaps be interested in it—that when after the first accident I had proceeded to recount to one who was with myself in that accident my recollection of the splendid way in which others had come to the assistance of myself and others, he made me absolutely blush to the roots of my then hair that I myself had been guilty of a kind action.

In regard to this paper which I have to lay before you now, I want to say—and again I am going to make a reference which ultimately you may consider somewhat of a personal sort—that while there may be many charges which might be levelled against me at various periods of my life, I have never until this morning had it suggested that I was a wealthy man. I refer you to all my friends, and I think they will reply to you in the spirit of the man alluded to in the play called "The Almighty Dollar," acted by Florence, who, in answer to the question, "Do you sing?" replied, "Those who have heard me say I do not." I allude to this because it is a far truer picture of myself to contemplate me clothed only with modest pyjamas than to consider me clothed with purple and fine linen and faring sumptuously every day. What I was going to allude to in the paper was this, that I invite your very kind consideration of me in this matter, as I am only an alternate. The paper was really assigned to some one else, and when they found that by reason of illness the original speaker was not available, they asked me to take it, and I, quite cognizant of my limitations, assented to do so. But, in dealing with the paper of another, I may recall a little story to be found in a book entitled "Scotch Wit and Humour," telling how a certain gentleman, Alexander Monro Tertius, was too lazy to write his own lecture, and adopted instead a lecture written by his grandfather in 1800 odd. It was originally written in Latin, and he took the trouble to translate it into English, but did not take the trouble to change the dates, so that those medical students in Edinburgh, listening to a lecture in 1820, were astounded with some such sentence as this: "When I was in Padua in 1694." The appositeness of the allusion you will perhaps recognize when I tell you that Alexander Monro Tertius was my own great-grandfather. I am, in like case, dealing with something fabricated by another, and I therefore claim your kind attention if I do not seem to deal with it adequately and well. I will do my best.

This matter of a minimum wage law is here for our consideration, and I am not at all sure that all the units making up your party—if I may so denominate it—on the other side of the House are in agreement in the matter, because as it presents itself to us it is not by any means a certain thing. Nay, rather, I should say that the contrary was certain, namely, that the minimum wage law would not be a good thing for the workers. Incidentally you are confronted by the opposition of two guiding principles. One, the law of competition, which inevitably means that the country or state or province which is enabled to get voluntarily the lowest wages will lead in competition and drive out the state, province, or nation which has a higher wage law imposed upon it. That is the first proposition. There is another consideration, and

I admit its existence at once, and that is, that you must not have such wages as will mean that the living of the country is not up to the standard which it should reach, and that therefore you get a degradation of the national life which is not consistent with the proper existence of the state itself.

Under these circumstances, what is the attitude of our side of the House upon this proposition? That in respect to women, who are the mothers of the coming generation, and in respect to children, we at once say that anything submitted for our consideration to arrange that they shall have the minimum wage law will at once meet with our sympathetic endorsation. I understand that, in respect, perhaps, of certain retail merchanting there may be some exception; but in the discussion of the general matter I think that need not be regarded; and, therefore, generally speaking, our attitude is this: That with regard to both women and children it is consistent with our general notions as to wage law that a minimum law be fixed, but that in respect of men it would be unfortunate to have any such thing take place.

Now, I wonder if you are really in agreement that it would be a good thing to have a minimum wage law? As the matter presents itself to my mind it is an exceedingly doubtful thing. We find, in the first place, that the matter is of extraordinary complexity, so that to have it dealt with would mean a great consideration upon the part of those dealing with it, and not only a great consideration but also a very thorough study of all the elements which go into an inquiry on the subject. And I submit that we are not in that case at the present juncture; that, as a matter of fact, we cannot properly deal with it, certainly not in an affirmative way, and that, so far as the present occasion goes at all events, there can be but one answer, namely, that we do not see our way clear to say that it would be a good thing for the workers themselves to have a minimum wage law.

Let me invite your consideration to this thought. You may perhaps think that it will be inconsistent, more or less, with some other things said by me. Should you so think, I am not concerned. In all these matters we have to consider things frankly. I suggest for your consideration, first of all, that the making of a minimum wage law is quite likely to have the tendency of making what was constituted the minimum wage ultimately the maximum. Cast your minds back to the period prior to the war, prior to that extraordinarily glorious day, August 4, 1914. Supposing that at that date a minimum wage law had been fixed in the Dominion of Canada, where should we have been throughout the war? You perhaps will reply that, dealing with these abnormal circumstances, we should have changed our general attitude with regard to wages so as to meet the situation. Conceivably that would have been the case. But contemplate the situation now, when the war is at an end. Where should we have found ourselves to-day, had such a minimum wage law been imposed? I think unquestionably, according to our common consent, any minimum wage law then imposed would have been less than any such minimum that you have in your minds to suggest that we fix, if in fact you have any minimum in your minds at the present time.

Then, looking at the matter from another standpoint, the economic standpoint, without reference to the human—after all, what is labour? Viewed as an economic proposition, it is something which is purchased; it is bought by means of those things which we call wages. In that respect, therefore, it is on common ground with other commodities that are bought. How would it occur to you if this were suggested by any portion of the community that we should impose, in respect of all commodities other than labour, a minimum wage or purchase price? Instantly we are shocked at the notion, and it occurs to me that perhaps that shock, though less, might take place in the case of wages also. Are we prepared to enter now upon anything which would so violently affect the constitution as this thing, the imposition of a minimum wage law? I should certainly suppose not.

Next, even if generally speaking it might be thought well that there should be a minimum wage law, I am going to speak of it from a somewhat selfish standpoint. Are we at all prepared to say that this is the best time, from the standpoint of Canada, to have a minimum wage law fixed? As we learned more particularly this morning, there is shortly to be an International Conference at Washington on the subject of wages and other cognate matters. Are we to put ourselves in this position, that we enter into that Conference fettered to a certain extent by having already passed upon points which, if dealt with unsatisfactorily, may in fact make us, instead of being more efficient, less efficient as component parts of the whole, making up that symposium that will deal

with the matter? I doubt it very much. I suggest to you on the other side, even to those of you who have as you think now made up your minds—I suggest to you that it would be exceedingly wise to postpone any action upon this particular point from this particular time. It is in my humble judgment—for I confess that I am not absolutely well versed in the subject—a most deplorable thing that at this particular stage, in the matter of these negotiations, those interested in labour should themselves, as I look at it, fetter themselves in the effort to deal well by themselves in any international conference which may take place.

Now, this, perhaps, is not a point, but it alludes to a general principle which has been spoken of here. We have been reminded of the Golden Rule. I speak absolutely frankly and from the bottom of my heart when I say that, if I am to apply to my consideration of this matter the principle of the Golden Rule, most distinctly I should take the attitude which I am taking. Had I the pleasure of being associated with yourselves immediately, unquestionably, with such knowledge as I have at my command, my view would be that it would be an ill thing, and not a good thing, for labour to have a minimum wage law fixed in the Dominion of Canada. Sincerely I believe that it would hurt and not help the workers of the country generally.

There is a very grave consideration in all these matters, and it is that, as we have been reminded several times, we are obliged to consider the question nationally. Neither you nor I are entitled to consider this from a selfish standpoint, nor are we collectively entitled to so consider it. We do not make up the whole Dominion of Canada. I think it may be said of the interests which are not represented here that in point of fact they are greater interests on the whole than are we together. But, whatever that comparison may be, certainly it is a fact that we do not represent the whole of Canada; and when I come to consider the vast body of consumers and the vast agricultural interests of this country, I say to myself, by what right have I to become a party to any such suggestion as this, not being in doubt, but without knowing absolutely that it would be a good thing for the country? Are we going to find, after our recommendation, that we are sorry to have made it? I honestly believe that, not we on this side alone, but your side also, would gravely regret any such step as this if it were taken.

There are one or two other things to which I wish to allude. As I view this matter, one of the greatest possible aids towards readjustment in this country will be, I think we all agree, an increase in production; and there is a subordinate point arising from that which I draw to your attention, and it is this, that we wish to increase the individual efficiency in respect of production. I admit quite frankly that it is only natural, and in a sense only right, that your interest should be, as you have already frankly stated it is, for the average man; but there are considerations even in respect of the average man. Supposing that you impose a minimum wage for the benefit of a man whose efficiency is not, we will say, 100 per cent, but who is in a general sense a pretty good workman; and supposing that, by reason of the imposition of that minimum wage, he is not able reasonably—from your own standpoint, if you will—to satisfy the desires of his employer; what must happen? Inevitably, some one must be obtained who is more efficient than he. So I suggest that even from the standpoint of the average worker it is extremely doubtful that what you are apparently seeking to accomplish will in fact be brought about.

But when you turn from that to another point, the argument seems to me to be all the stronger. True, I admit, we are to be concerned with the average man; but is there to be no regard had for those of you who are superior to your fellows in point of work? Is it to come about that, by the imposition of a minimum wage law, which by those paying it is considered too high, they cannot give any sort of effect or encouragement to superior efficiency upon the part of superior men? In my individual judgment that would be a most deplorable circumstance. Personally I am a great believer in the personal equation. I do not think that men are alike amongst themselves nor that women are alike amongst themselves. They differ in respect of efficiency. And whilst I am prepared, with you, to see that the average man does get proper regard and proper consideration, I also suggest that there should be some scope for the man who knows in his own mind that he is really more efficient than his fellows and should get a larger wage. I suggest that if you get an all-round wage law, imposed against the will of those who are paying wages, you are quite likely to impair the possibility on the part of those employing to pay due attention to work which is so pre-eminently good that it ought to get the fitting reward for work which is pre-eminently good.

Now, I am not going to occupy your time any longer except to point out generally one or two things. I have said just now that in this, as in all things, we must work together. What is my confidence in regard to this Conference based upon? It is based upon this circumstance, which originally, as a matter of hypothesis, I was willing to assume would be the case, that I should find men of good-will on both sides of the House. I now base my opinion not upon hypothesis, but upon an ascertained fact. It has been demonstrated absolutely to the intelligence not alone of those of us who have taken part in this debate, but also those who are onlookers, that on both sides of this particular room there are men of good-will—men of such good-will that they are content, within reasonable limits, to abandon any misconception they may have had, if such abandonment would make for the general weal; and that is the position, most distinctly, in which I find myself to-day.

I have listened with interest to the many speakers upon the other side, including the lady representative from Vancouver, who spoke with a passion which one looks for upon the part of woman who devotes herself so keenly to those things which are near at hand, whether her own children, her own brother, or anything that is beloved. That attitude one expects upon the part of women. You find on the part of men a greater detachment and perhaps an inclination to look farther on. But, generally speaking, as I say, I have found men of good will; and I charge you that you have found on our side men of good will also, and it is by those elements that things are to be accomplished if good is to be done.

It was said this morning that threats had not been made, and I was glad to have that denial. It has also been said that the reports of this Conference go world-wide, extending beyond the confines of our own country. Therefore, not alone for our side but for yours also, and in a sense particularly for yours, I here place on record this statement, that threats have not been made, but if they had been made they would have been hopelessly opposed by the genius of this gathering, unfair alike to the manhood on the side making the threat and to the manhood of those listening, who did not record at once their grave and earnest protest.

That is the situation in which we find ourselves to-day. I ask you to forgive me for the limitations, absolutely evident to myself, perhaps almost as evident to me as to yourselves—the limitations of this utterance to which you have listened; but I do say for it that it is sincere; I do suggest for it that it is worth your consideration. And, for myself, and for those with whom I am associated, speaking from the knowledge of what I have heard, not here alone, but also in the intimacies of our council room, where we speak frankly and heart to heart, where one listens to the most sympathetic utterances with regard to the opposing side—I say, in the light of all these things, our attitude in respect of this item and in respect of every other matter that we shall discuss, is this, that insistently and consistently and persistently we shall speak, not for the interest of ourselves, nor for yours and ours together, but for all the interests of the Dominion of Canada.

Miss HELENA GUTTERIDGE (Vancouver, B.C.): Mr. Chairman and Delegates: The last speaker said at the opening of his speech that the opposition were agreed upon the necessity of a minimum wage for women and minors. That is something new to me. For many years women and labour have been fighting most strenuously to obtain the recognition of the right of women to a minimum wage, which should be a living wage, and it is somewhat in the nature of death-bed repentance, I think, because the principle of a minimum wage for women has been recognized throughout practically the whole civilized world. A large number of states in the United States have had it in effect for a long time. New Zealand and Australia have had it in effect for a long time. England has had it in effect in a number of industries.

Coming home to Canada itself, we have a minimum wage law in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and, I believe, in Quebec. Ontario, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, I think, are the only provinces in Canada without a minimum wage law.

I am going to show you right now, from a very concrete instance in this very city of Ottawa, how very necessary it is that Ontario should also have a minimum wage law. I shall quote just one fact, and it is a fact which can be verified. You can go yourself to the place where this information was obtained, and you can get the direct information.

Two days ago, in this city, I came in contact with a person who gave me some information in regard to the conditions under which some women were working in the city of Ottawa. One woman worked for

one whole week and two nights overtime. She was working by piece-work, and she earned the magnificent sum of $3.37—right here in the city of Ottawa! An absolute fact, and it can be proven. She was paid at the piece-work rate, and for the particular operation she was doing she was getting four cents per dozen. In order to earn twelve dollars a week she would have had to perform that particular operation on that garment 300 dozen times. The worst part of it is that the same order for garments has been distributed among t manufacturers throughout the province, most of whom are working under trades union agreements and are paying the union scale. They are doing that same kind of work. This particular manufacturer is receiving the same amount of payment for the making of the garment as are the others who are paying the higher scale. The amount paid for this particular operation under fair conditions is something like 18½ cents as compared with the rate of four cents by this manufacturer. The manufacturer here in Ottawa had not even the excuse that he was in competition with the others; they were all getting the same rate for the garments. It was an order that had been distributed amongst a large number of manufacturers, and he certainly was in unfair competition with his fellow-manufacturers when he was getting his work done at that low rate, when the others were paying fair wages. So, if it were only for the manufacturers to protect themselves, they should see that such a condition as that is not possible. That would be good business, apart from the sentimental aspect, which most persons consider to be the view taken by women. The fact is that a girl could not possibly keep body and soul together on an average of $3.37 a week.

Mr. Grier stated that we were all agreed to the principle of a minimum wage for women and minors, on the ground particularly that the women were the mothers of the next generation. That is agreed, and it is a very sad thing indeed if the mothers of the future generation are not physically fit and able to bring healthy, happy children into the world, who will also have a standing as human beings. Therefore it is equally necessary that they shall have a minimum wage for their own sake as well as for the sake of the future generation.

During the discussion yesterday and today I several times heard the remark made that we are not all alike. Granted, we are not all alike. The good Lord did not make us all alike; but, unfortunately sometimes for those who have to make a living, we are all alike in some particulars. We all have to eat; we all have to have a place to live in; we all have to have clothes to wear; and we are all subject occasionally to sickness and need the assistance of a nurse or a doctor. At least, we have all these things in common, and it is because we are alike in these respects that it is necessary to establish a minimum wage law which will state not only that so much shall be paid to every woman or man, or every worker, skilled or unskilled, but which will state that any person working for a living, particularly women and men in unskilled trades, shall receive a wage upon which they can live. If Mr. Grier's statement is correct, that the women being the mothers of the next generation need protection, the same thing applies in the case of men, because an underpaid man is as much the father of the coming generation as an underpaid woman would be the mother. Moreover, he has even a heavier burden to bear in this respect. While the good health of the mother ensures the good health of the child, and the good health of the father ensures the good health of the child, at the same time if the father of a family is earning a wage which is not sufficient to support himself and that family, then it is not only the future generation but the children of the present generation who are being underfed and therefore are not what we call good citizens. Every argument that can be applied to a minimum wage for women can be equally applied to the establishment of a minimum wage for every individual.

Mr. Grier seemed to be labouring under the impression that we were asking for the establishment of a maximum wage. We are not doing anything of the kind, but we are asking that the unskilled worker shall be protected. The skilled worker is usually able to take care of himself through his organizations so far as increasing the minimum wage is concerned; and so far as the maximum wage is concerned there is no need to do anything. The skilled worker is not going to have his wages cut down; but the law should be established so as to enable the unskilled worker to keep his wife and family.

I want to quote an example of the conditions under which some men are compelled to bring up families. In one trade, a skilled trade, there are at the present time in the employment of some of the large corporations of the Dominion of Canada a number of men who are acting as waiters in various hotels throughout the country. Some of them, not very many miles from here, are

receiving the magnificent sum of $7 a week. They are expected to eke out that wage with gratuities. The general public are expected to make up the wages of those men to a sufficient amount to support a wife and family, the assumption being usually that a man marries and raises a family. If he does not do so, he is looked upon as a slacker, and is of no use to the country.

We hear the cry, "More production." Greater production is necessary, more and more production, because it is necessary for the well-being of Canada. You cannot produce goods of any kind without the people to produce them. Nevertheless, you penalize a great number of men who would marry and bring families into the world, increasing the number of workers and in that way increasing the production, to such an extent that they cannot marry, or, if they do marry and bring up children, they do so under such conditions that the next generation will not be much good because of their poor physical make-up, due to the conditions under which they were brought up, and production becomes less because of the inefficiency of the people. The wage that the men I have referred to are receiving is not a recognized living wage, because men in similar positions on the railroads and coming within the scope of the Railway War Board received an increase in their wages of 100 per cent, which was a direct recognition of the fact that previously the wages had been insufficient.

There are other occupations to which this would apply. There are a large number of men whom you call unskilled labourers who are existing on very low wages. Curiously enough, it is the unskilled worker who is subject to unemployment probably more than the skilled worker. I ask you first of all to ask yourselves, is the unskilled worker necessary to production? If he is not necessary, why do you employ him? If he is necessary to production in any particular industry, a living wage should be guaranteed to him, and it should come out of the industry in which he is engaged.

I have heard, and I am sure my information is correct, that when an investigation was made into the question of how much profit had been made during the last few years by some of the large concerns in the country, one manager or owner of a particular concern, whose profits were shown to have increased 81½ per cent, said that they were not operating those mills for the glory of God. It may be that you think that we are looking upon this question from the point of view of sentiment; but we also know that no man who engages in business is operating any plant for the glory of God or for any other purpose than that of making profit. No man goes into business because he is a philanthropist; no corporation carries on business because they are philanthropists; they could not continue in business and be so. They are in business for one reason, and one reason only, and when they set out to study the cost of operation and the cost of the production of their particular product, they should take into consideration the question of wages, and if the product is going to be produced they should pay a living wage. If they cannot do that they should not enter upon the business at all, quite apart from any sentiment for the workers or of operating for the glory of God. We know quite well from bitter experience—and I myself know from coming into contact with those opposed to minimum wages for women—that there is not a business anywhere that is operated for the glory of God, or for the glory of anything, but that they are operated for profit alone.

It has been said that this is a national question; and if both sides of this House can look upon it as such, we can come to a common understanding before the conclusion of this Conference. It is a national question, and that was evidently recognized by Premier Borden, when he wrote his opening address, from which, if you will excuse me, I am going to quote. In one part of his address he says:

> Industrial development and supremacy have sometimes been purchased at a price greater than any people can afford to pay. I am speaking not of conditions in this country, but of those which, to my knowledge, have prevailed elsewhere. The physical degeneracy of a considerable portion of the population is too high a price to pay for domination of the world's markets. If in any lines of industrial development we cannot hold our own without so terrible a sacrifice, then such lines ought to be abandoned and our effort directed elsewhere. Labour is something more than a commodity. The physical well-being and the moral welfare of the people should go hand in hand. Standards of living which are regarded as satisfactory in some industrial communities of the world cannot be tolerated in this country. The employer, if he is wise, will concern himself with all the recommendations and suggestions laid down in the Peace Conference as to hours of labour, sanitary conditions, protection of women and children, and the general welfare of the labouring man. There can be no permanent or satisfactory industrial development which is not founded on the welfare of the labouring population which maintains it.

We must look at this question from either one of two standpoints—from the

national point of view which demands the wellbeing of the whole people of the country, and the workers are the majority of the people. That being so, their welfare and wellbeing must be considered. You may call that looking at it from the sentimental standpoint. If you look at it from the national standpoint, you will look at it with the assurance that every worker, particularly the so-called unskilled worker, will get a living wage, so that they may be in good health and good condition, and so that the nation will be made up of a body of healthy, happy citizens.

If you do not regard the question from that standpoint, you can only regard it from the point of view of labour being a commodity and as though you employed labour as you install machinery in your buildings for the purpose of production. In order to build up industries and to produce articles for the upkeep of this country it is necessary to get efficiency, and you must admit that efficient human machinery is just as necessary as other machinery, to secure such efficiency a living wage must be paid. If you look at the question from the standpoint of efficiency, greater production, and a better output, then you have to have an efficient human machine, no matter whether or not you call it an unskilled machine. A man may be unskilled, but the fact that you employ him shows that he is necessary. No one employs more help than he has to. That being so, the workers should be paid sufficient to enable them to keep the human machine in good condition, sufficient to enable them to get plenty of food and rest and so they may have plenty of energy to go on with the work of the next day. You know yourselves how it is to be without sufficient food. You have probably had to go without meals for some length of time when you were busy, and you know what a physical wreck you became. How much more so is that the case when a man or a woman is always underfed? Their condition is far worse than yours, and it is only by the means that I have outlined that you can bring about the production which is so absolutely necessary at the present time.

What I have said does not begin to cover the question of unemployment; but if we are going to have production, apart altogether from the physical welfare of the workers, we have to take into consideration the mental unrest of the underpaid and underfed worker, and we know that he is not a good worker.

In England, from which I happen to come, the question of a living wage, particularly where women were concerned, was under discussion, and I remember a remark that was made by some well-known statesman or politician or member of Parliament—I forget just which he was—

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Miss GUTTERIDGE: Sometimes they are the same thing and sometimes they are not. This gentleman said that efficient workers could not be raised on tea and bread and butter, which, upon investigation, had been found to be the daily food of a large number of the working people. Employers of labour are to a great extent bringing about that condition of inefficiency when they do not pay a living wage.

The minimum wage is not going to interfere with the maximum wage. Mr. Gries need not worry about the skilled worker. He said that a man who had a greater degree of ability should receive more than one who had not so much ability. I agree with him; but that does not alter the fact that even the man who lacks the higher degree of ability must be given a living wage.

We have been told during this Conference that the industries of the country could not possibly stand the strain that would be put upon them—that they would have to go out of business. If that is true, it simply means that it would be better that they should go out of business than exist upon the degeneracy of the workers. After all, I do not know, and you cannot tell me, what was the object of our coming into this world. We are not in this world for the sole purpose of building up industry. We are here as human beings, and the first object with us is life, and self-preservation is the first law of nature. To obey that law we must have enough food to eat, enough clothing to wear, and comfortable shelter. The building up of industry is a secondary consideration. We agree that it is a very important one, and to a great extent the subject matter of this Conference. I do not think that any industries would have to go out of business.

I work at the tailoring trade, and am interested in the garment-making trade. The textile trade is a somewhat similar kind of industry. It is in some of those lines we are told, particularly in regard to the wages of women, that we must not press for too high wages, for those industries

cannot bear it. I am going to quote what was discovered after a Government investigation of one particular industry, the Dominion Textile Mills. I am informed that recently there was a strike of the employees of that particular firm for increased wages; and that that strike was justified is quite evident, because the investigation showed that 312 per cent profit was made by that particular firm during the four years of the war. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you tell me that an increase in wages, or a living wage paid to the workers in that industry, is going to drive that firm out of business, is going to ruin it, you will have to bring forward some very great proof indeed, in view of the results of that investigation into the profits that were made by that industry. Now, I am not assuming that every industry is in that position; but you cannot possibly tell me that the paying of an adequate living wage to employees in any particular industry is going to drive that industry out of business unless you bring forward evidence showing the cost of the operations required in producing the particular articles which it produces, and just how much there is of what you call profits.

I will give another reason for the necessity of establishing a living wage. In the West we have the competition of Chinese labour. We workers have absolutely no objection to Chinamen because they happen to be Chinamen, or to any other nationality; but we find employers of labour, the mill-owners in the province of British Columbia, admitting, as they did before the Royal Commission, that they employed Chinamen, that the wages they paid them would not maintain the standard of living for a white man; and therefore they did not employ white men. This unfair competition with the white workers is very bad indeed; therefore we need a minimum wage which shall be a proper living wage. If an employer prefers Chinamen we have nothing to say; but he should pay to the Chinaman or to any other man employed a wage which shall be a living wage according to the standards that now prevail in the Dominion of Canada, or a better standard if it can possibly be obtained. Thus the unfair competition between Chinamen and white men would be removed, and the most efficient workman would no doubt get the job, and both white men and Chinamen would be ensured enough wages each day to reproduce energy for the next day's work.

It is not necessary for me to go into the reasons for the legislation we are asking for women, because I understand that that point has already been conceded by the speaker for the employers—though, as I have said, somewhat late in the day—because practically the whole Dominion of Canada has a minimum wage law for women in operation at the present time. But one thing necessary is the co-ordination of the operations of this minimum wage law in the various provinces throughout the whole of Canada, the speedy enactment of such laws in Ontario and the other provinces where they do not yet exist; and then such co-ordination, through the Dominion Parliament, of the various provinces that there will be a means of comparison between the different provinces in regard to the cost of living and the minimum wage.

Another thing. The spirit of co-operation between employers and workers must be real and hearty, or we will find ourselves in a position such as British Columbia occupies at present. In that province the minimum wage is fixed by a Conference composed of three workers in the industry, three employers of labour in the industry, and three members of the public; and the Conference is presided over by the three members of the Minimum Wage Commission. The findings of that Conference are given to the members of the commission, and if accepted by the commission they are supposed to be enacted, and the amount agreed upon is supposed to become the minimum wage. In order to ascertain what that wage shall be, evidence is received from witnesses before that Conference, and very detailed evidence is taken in regard to the actual cost of living, right down to the smallest expenditure of the women concerned. I am going to cite a recent instance of the working of this minimum wage law in British Columbia. After the public inquiry was over and the evidence had been taken, the board went into conference and cut down every item they possibly could on the list of items of living expense, and finally a vote was taken, which resulted in showing that at least $14 per week was necessary to provide a living for a woman over the age of eighteen, experienced, and employed in those particular industries. The cost of living is high in the West, and that was the amount agreed upon. I was a member of that Conference. The employers' representatives signed the resolution and agreed to it, and said that they

were of the opinion that a girl could not live on a wage less than that. Now note what followed. In British Columbia we have a Factories Act, which says that not more than 48 hours per week shall be worked; that is the maximum number of hours except under certain conditions. By custom the majority of the factories work only 44 hours a week—8 hours a day, but only 4 hours on Saturday. It was brought to the attention of the Conference that there might be an attempt to raise the hours to 48, and it was decided that this should be the minimum wage for a 44-hour week. However, there happened to be some little error in an amendment to the Factories Act which brought it into conflict with the Minimum Wage Act; so we found that after the representatives of employers had agreed that it required $14 as a minimum wage in that occupation, when it came to the payment of that wage they took off $1.25 per week for the 4 hours which were not worked on Saturday, and thus cut down the living wage to $12.75, because they said the girls were not working the maximum number of hours they should work in order to get that $14 per week. If that is the spirit of co-operation that is going to be shown between the employing class and the workers, it does not make us very hopeful. I do hope, however, that such anomalies as that may be removed, and such a Conference as the present will remove these difficulties. It would be only fair to the employees that the minimum wage should be so much that anything below that amount cannot be lived on. Therefore it is a farce, though a grim one, to say that $14 is the living wage and then to pay only $12.75 after the work has actually been done.

I would like to point out once more, both from the points of view of sentiment and that of national wellbeing, as well as greater production and greater efficiency, on the part of both women and unskilled workers, it is advisable and necessary that a law be enacted that every worker employed shall receive a minimum wage which shall be a living wage.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the next speaker addresses the Conference, I desire to express my delight at the way in which the two speakers who have introduced this subject have dealt with it. I do not think there have been many cases, when legislation has been introduced in this House or the other House of Parliament, when the debate has been on a higher plane or the subject more splendidly handled than has been done in the introduction of the minimum wage question into this Conference. I think it argues well for the ultimate success of the deliberations on the questions with which you are to deal.

Mr. E. PARNELL (Winnipeg): As Mr. Grier has already told you, it was not part of his duty to introduce this subject. That had been relegated to me, but owing to ill-health I was unable to do it, and did not expect to be able to say anything to-day at all. Fortunately I feel much better, and the opportunity to speak to this assembly was so great that I could not but take a few minutes.

I regret exceedingly that the preceding speaker has seen fit to intimate that the concession of a minimum wage law for women and girls by the employers of labour is a death-bed repentance on their part, for this subject has been under discussion by them for a long time. It has been introduced into many States of the Union, and also into several provinces of Canada. It has been on the statute-book of Manitoba for some considerable time. I want to say that if we are going to get co-operation it is better that we should not impute motives or ideas which would lead anybody in this House to think that this had been a death-bed repentance rather than a decision that had been fairly and reasonably considered. In the caucus held at the hotel in connection with this very matter the gentlemen representing the manufacturers agreed by unanimous consent, without any hesitation at all, to the arrangement that women and children should have a minimum wage. There was practically no discussion about it, and I want to give those gentlemen credit for their decision.

The Commission whose findings we are here to-day to consider and discuss in Joint Conference has made a number of recommendations, the object of which is to strike at the root of the unrest and discontent which appears, and which in fact permeates the minds of a large number of employees of this country. That this discontent is not of recent birth but has been of long standing, I believe, cannot be successfully denied; but the conditions created by the war are, to my mind, the real factor which have made it the live issue which it is, and were the direct cause of the appointment by the Government of the Commission to investigate and report on the causes of these conditions. The report contains a number of suggestions which one might attempt to discuss in a rambling address which would get us nowhere, and which would only waste the

time of this convention. Therefore, it is my intention at this time to confine myself to the one subject on the agenda, namely, the minimum wage.

I propose to discuss the relation of the minimum wage to labour conditions. The view which has long prevailed that labour is but a part of the finished product, and must of necessity be treated on the same basis as the materials which go to make the finished article, without any regard as to whether the labourer is enabled to get from the wage paid the necessaries of life, is one that in my opinion must be discarded; in other words, labour should no longer be treated merely as a commodity.

I am well aware that I will be confronted with the statement that in this age of competition it is impossible to run a business successfully along these lines, and that industry can only pay according to the ability of the employee to produce; that, if you adopt a minimum wage, what will become of those unable to earn it; that it would generally retard employment for the reason that greater cost affects competition, and that employers are unable to stand the abnormal wage. My answer is that the minimum wage is now in force in this country in many factories; it is given voluntarily to the men, by statute to the women, and it has not been found to work to the detriment of either employer or employee. On the contrary the employee has had a wage which has enabled him to get a better standard of living, he has had more strength to attend to the duties he has to perform, and has had a contentment in his heart that has led to greater efficiency which has fully compensated the employer for any loss he may have seemed to sustain. At the moment industry does not need, or is not compelled to give employment to any particular individual; but the basic principle of minimum wage is that if industry does so employ, then it must see that such employee gets a wage sufficient to provide him or her with a living which shall at least not be less than the subsistence line based on the law of averages as they obtain in this country.

However, there are, in my opinion, some features with regard to any minimum wage law that might be introduced that should receive careful consideration. There should be no attempt to fix an arbitrary statutory amount as the wage to be paid. In the consideration of this subject due regard should be paid to the difficulties which surround the industries, and also the varying conditions created by the extent of this country, reaching as it does from the Atlantic to the Pacific. On the contrary I am firmly convinced that the only safe way of establishing a minimum wage is by industries; and then only after a thorough investigation has been made, giving due effect to the grade of living required by the employees in each industry.

Then again there appears to be an inclination on the part of some so called minimum wage boards to depart from the fundamental principle of minimums, and practically to establish maximums, or, in other words, to fix the real wage to be paid the employee. Let me say that I believe the moment this course is pursued you destroy the efficacy of the law and at once raise an antagonism to the Act that prevents the full benefits being derived.

Minimum Wage Acts should contain a clause allowing the employment of defectives, on application to the board, at a wage to be agreed on.

Then there is the question as to whether such Acts should be federal or provincial in their character and scope. If provincial, what protection could be given to the province with the higher standards as against those provinces that fail to adopt standards of a similar character?

I am further convinced that boards created to carry out such an Act should be composed of representatives from both employers and employees, with an independent chairman, who should be empowered to deal with conditions of labour, hours and the minimum wage to be paid.

The commission's report makes a recommendation that a minimum wage should apply to women, girls and unskilled labour. With reference to the latter class, while I have stated that it is now worked out voluntarily in some industries as it relates to males, still it is to a large extent in the experimental stage as far as they are concerned; but with regard to females it is now past the experimental and is found to be working quite satisfactorily, as is evidenced in the province of Manitoba, from which province I come. I may add that I have acted as a member of that board since its inception until very recently, as also Mr. Winning, a labour representative to this Conference. The mode of operation was as follows: On the formation of the board we at once set out by careful investigation to find the lowest amount for which a girl of eighteen could get the bare necessities of life. Having arrived at that amount, we then took an industry, picked out about three representative plants, and paid

them a visit, so as to get acquainted with the conditions under which the girls worked in that industry. We then called a conference of three employers and three employees who sat in with the board with equal voting power, to determine the conditions of labour, hours and minimum wage that should apply to that particular industry, the board afterwards confirming them as a board. When I tell you that in the forty odd awards that were made for as many different industries we in every case came to a unanimous conclusion, you will readily see that there must be some merit in the scheme. However, to make sure that we were making no mistakes a public meeting of all interested, which included the four groups mentioned at this conference, was called at a convenient time and place, and after this meeting the award in full was published in the Manitoba Gazette, and thirty days thereafter it became law.

Since our first decision as to how much it costs a girl to live we have been compelled to alter our amount, and to-day the lowest minimum we have is $11 and the highest $12.50. On page 37 of the proposed agenda we have a fair statement of what the Act contains, and what the effect has been. I would draw your attention to the fact that that was only six months after the board began operations. It has been in operation now nearly a year and three-quarters, and up to the present time, as I said before, we have made about forty-two awards. I want to correct a statement made by one of the speakers yesterday, when he said that the minimum wage in Manitoba was $10.50. The lowest, as I said before, is $11, and the highest is $12.50.

In closing, I desire to say that we found cases of girls working as long as ninety hours a week, and others at a wage which simply meant starvation; but in the majority of cases we found the employers fair and just to their employees. But, ladies and gentlemen, the girls of to-day are the mothers of the future generation. We have, I am sorry to admit, some employers who are ready to exploit, and do exploit, this class of labour. I ask you, where conditions are such that these girls of ours are worked too long or do not get the nourishment necessary to build up a healthy body, what must be the effect upon their children and the homes of the future generation? I appeal to you as a conference of men and women who have come here for the purpose of trying to bring out of these deliberations something of a practical character. I am delighted with the spirit that has been shown here. For a long time I have endeavoured in every way within my power to urge upon capital and labour to get together for just such a conference as we are having at the present time. I may take advanced views on this matter of the minimum wage, but, ladies and gentlemen, as the previous speaker has said, we have to think not only of the financial reward that may come from having these people employed, but also of the necessities which they have to buy so that they may live. I therefore appeal to you as citizens realizing your duty to God and the State, to wipe out at once the possibility of such conditions by adopting a resolution which will be the means of having legislation passed that will put on the statute book, if not of the Dominion, at least of every province of this fair land, a minimum wage for our women and girls.

Mr. WILLIAM McKENZIE (Vancouver): The Conference generally agree that every worker is entitled to at least a living wage. I have been sent here for the purpose of representing a large number of men employed in the hotel trades of this country. We all know that many of these men are skilled workers. It has been mentioned by the speaker who introduced the subject, Miss Helena Gutteridge, that an average of $7 a week is being paid now by the largest corporations of this country. We need not mention who they are; we all know. This is a fact; and this is not something that has been going on for a short time only, but it has been going on for years. Repeated efforts have been made to try to better conditions of employment in this corporation, but to no avail. The workers themselves have organized from time to time, but they have been effectively crushed by the company.

You ask us why we would like this amendment put through. It is easy to understand. Such a low wage has a tendency to create ill-feeling all around. How do you expect employees to live? They are living on charity at the present time, and have been living on that for years, and it has lowered the moral standard of this class of workers, who are, we know, as necessary to the community as any other class. These statements apply to men as well as to girls in this particular industry.

Coming to Ottawa, I find that the girls in this city engaged in this class of work are working now for $4 a week. It may surprise you to learn that they are organized too, but the organization has been kept down, especially, as I have said before, by the larger companies, and it has been im-

possible for them to get any higher wages.

Strikes are taking place every year, from coast to coast, in this class of work, and naturally to the detriment of the workers. They go out for a week, but are forced back by necessity. As I said before, they are not altogether unskilled; they are engaged in a class of work that requires them to keep up to a standard, that is, with regard to clothes, and so on. The average amount which it takes to clothe the workers in this particular line is from $70 to $80 a year. Looking at the figures published in the Labour Gazette, which is issued monthly, we find what it costs a man to keep a family. According to those figures, what do we find? We find that the moral standard is bound to be lowered, because these people have to lower themselves by accepting gratuities and are doing this right along.

There is another point, which to my mind is very vital. As I said before, we have managed to organize, and in the smaller businesses of this description we have managed to get a living wage. In the city of Vancouver the average wage paid is $17 a week. That is paid in the majority of restaurants. In one of the largest hotels in the city of Vancouver the average wage paid is $8 a week, and the worker there has to show more efficiency in every way. Therefore, when you consider this matter carefully you will, I think, agree that a minimum wage is necessary, owing to the fact that the discontent will be continued if the question is not looked into and if some law is not enacted to prohibit the exploitation of this class of workers. I am not going to say any more, Mr. Chairman. I think you will all agree that these remarks are to the point and they are facts.

Mr. J. B. THOMSON (Vancouver): Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have said anything on the floor of the House, and I want to compliment the Government, as some others have done, on their foresight in holding this Conference. It will be, I am sure, productive of good if we can impress upon both sides the causes for the present unrest and the means of removing it.

Now, while I agree with some of the opinions held on the other side of the House, I do not hold with them in one contention, in the main, and that is, that the national life of Canada is dependent upon industry. With your permission, I would like to read my remarks and then I will address myself briefly to the question of the minimum wage.

This Conference has been called, as properly explained, a National Conference. The harmony of our Canada is at stake. Capital and labour, as Lord Balfour's committee reported, hold a joint trust for the public. The product of industry is the only factor which can discharge the debt we have incurred in the protection of our women, our children and our property from the ruthless Hun.

To the expenditure of life, jointly with our savings and the mortgaging of our future, we owe our fortunate position today. Personally, I am Scotch, and it is an admitted trait of our race to be thrifty and also to discharge their obligations, whether on the battlefront or in financial circles. Continued production is the only solution we have for the problem of discharging the mortgage we have placed on our country. Surely every true citizen of our Dominion wants to make it easier for the generations which will follow, and not to burden them with the debt we have incurred.

Sir Thomas White's slogan during the Victory Loan campaign was: "Produce, and again produce." He omitted to say, "with a profit." His policy, coupled with our economy, made it possible to terminate the war as successfully as we have done. Let me emphasize that this is the only possible solution of our present financial situation. Production for export, over and above our own requirements, is the only means by which the trade balance against us can be placed on the other side of the ledger. In the opportunity to sell to other nations we have the true remedy, release from debt. Profitable production can be carried out successfully, for this purpose, by the development of our inheritance of natural resources, which furnish the base, and by making our products saleable on the markets of the world, and this is possible only at prices at which we can compete with other sources of supply. Now, if all of us—the workers, management, and capital—are sincere, we must co-operate to this end. Management considers that it knows something of the selling of a product profitably, as that is a matter within its department. May I state therefore that in comparison with other interests, management knows the cost of labour and what it can afford to concede, whether in hours of toil or in remuneration or conditions of labour, and what will leave a balance for profit. That balance is what we are going to have to liquidate the debt that we have incurred,

and we must bring about such economic conditions as will enable us to do so, either by legislation for a minimum wage, or otherwise. We must work in co-operation in order to increase production. If we are going to burden our industries with a minimum wage for unskilled labour, which, as has been ably pointed out by Mr. Grier, may not be a benefit even to those for whom the legislation is desired, it may not be possible for us to meet the competition which we shall have to face, unless we do something which I am sure those on the other side do not want to have done, that is, bring in labour which has a lower standard of living than ours. As Miss Gutteridge so well said, our first duty is self-preservation, and if others are taking that advantage, we also would have to do so. Now, I do not think any of you want to see any such development as that.

With reference to the minimum wage for girls, I think that possibly the conditions in Manitoba are fair, but in British Columbia they are very unfair. Our industry is faced with an award which approaches the maximum. She suggested a remedy to a certain extent by co-operation to allow that industry to develop; but the award allows us no source of supply from which we may draw recruits for the industry. A girl starts at $10 a week. Knowing her, as I do, and knowing a little something about the industry, I do not think it is possible to take upon our shoulders the responsibility of educating the girl at that price. When to that wage is added the forelady's time, it will be seen that this puts upon us a greater expense than we can bear. We shall be forced to do one of two things: either close the industry, or obtain fairly efficient skilled labour where we can get it, and pay the price. That local condition is a very serious consideration, as other industries are dependent on that. A parent may move to British Columbia with his family and may want something for them to do. If he has no opportunity of sending them to a training school, what is going to become of them? No matter what their ambition in life may be, they will be forced to enter the class of unskilled labour, and that is a class to which none of us with British blood in our veins want to belong. We want to work ourselves up to the highest possible standard in order that we may occupy if possible a position similar to that of the Colonel.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER: Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that the matter be referred to the committee at this stage, but I should like to mention just one or two points. However, I gather that, as Miss Gutteridge rose a moment ago, she desires to speak.

Mr. TOM MOORE: She was going to move the reference to the committee, that was all.

Mr. E. M. TROWERN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Provincial and Dominion Governments, ladies and gentlemen: I wish to say just a word on this matter, as representing the retail merchants of Canada. We, as you know, are fully in sympathy with the paying of good wages. That goes without saying. I just want to put ourselves on record in this matter. If any decision is to come to at this meeting with regard to fixing a minimum wage for girls and women, we want to see that those girls who are employed for a portion of the day in retail shops are fully protected, and I think that this is the time and the place for us to have our position fully understood. In the past, unfortunately, when any legislation has been considered or put on the statute book, if it was labour legislation, the labour people only have been consulted; if it was manufacturers' legislation, the manufacturers alone were consulted; if it was retail merchants' legislation, they alone were consulted. I think, ladies and gentlemen, that we should get beyond that position, and we have got beyond it. We must get together and consider these points jointly. It would be an unfortunate thing if legislation were to be placed on the statute books of this country, either provincial or Dominion, fixing a minimum wage, so that a girl who wished to be employed in a store taking cash during the lunch hour would be shut out. I am rising to defend you, ladies and gentlemen, on the other side, because these girls are in the position of workers, and we do not want legislation that is going to deprive them of employment. It is the easiest thing in the world to say we will get legislation. Legislation is the cause of half the evils that exist; then we have to get other legislation to stop them.

The lady to whom we all listened with so much pleasure said that all that was wanted was legislation to fix a minimum wage. She did not state any amount, but said, "We want a living wage." If you fix a wage of eight, or ten, or twelve or fourteen dollars a week, what will happen? How are you going to deal with this question? There are hundreds of girls employed all

over the country in the capacity which I have just mentioned. We want those girls protected. It is the same with men. There are many men, unskilled men, who come in, and whose services we utilize when we are busy.

I rise to point out the distributor's problem, because we are the people least known. Governments always rush in, we expect it; and if there is bad legislation it is generally put onto us. Now is the time for us to defend ourselves, and I wish to see that the individual I have referred to is protected.

Before anything is done in regard to this problem, we must first find out what we are going to do. I should like to see some one draft legislation to fit the various cases that have been mentioned this afternoon. I would not undertake it; it is beyond me; but I should like to see some one do it. I want it distinctly understood that no legislation that fits the manufacturers is going to fit the retailers. They are two entirely different classes, and must be regarded as such. Both in private conference and in public conference, I have made it quite clear that the retail class, the assistants, those who only work during certain portions of the day, must be protected in any legislation that is introduced.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER: Mr. Chairman, it is now understood that the matter may go to the Committee, and I simply rise to say one or two words in the nature of a reply. What I have to say, I take it, is not at all of a controversial character.

I, of course, am moved, as we all are moved, by the recital of individual cases of hardship; but I have never been very greatly impressed with arguments based upon the particular and applied to the general. Having made that remark, I wish again to repeat that all of us must be heartily in sympathy with any cases of hardship such as were cited by Miss Gutteridge.

I have not, as I recall what I have heard, listened to replies to the more general propositions that I advanced. If there have been replies to them, I know that they as well as all other observations made were of such a character that I could not take exception to them; and I am well content that the matter at this stage should go to the Committee.

I am not, however, content to sit down without saying two or three things of a more or less personal character. As I intimated before, I was entrusted with the task of introducing this question by reason of the absence of the gentlemen to whom it was originally assigned, and if there is any divergence between us, it is due to the fact that I had no opportunity of considering the matter with him.

Whilst I have taken the attitude which I have taken on the score of a minimum wage, and with absolute sincerity, none of the observations I made had the faintest reference to any industry with which I individually have any sort of connection. We have no kind of case which by any stretch of language could be construed as coming within any of the points with which I was dealing.

Since in a sense perhaps I am not an employer, but rather one of the employees, I should like to say that the industry with which I am connected, so far as my cognition goes, is one happy family. Of this I am quite sure, that every man there is my friend, and I believe they honour me by all of them considering me as theirs.

Miss HELENA GUTTERIDGE: In rising to second Mr. Grier's motion, I should like to refer to one or two points raised.

One gentleman pointed to some of the difficulties with retail clerks and referred to Ontario. I do not imagine that any condition exists that is peculiar to Ontario. The same difficulties have been faced and overcome in other places, and some of them in Canada; so the difficulties, to my mind, have ceased to exist. The Acts which have been passed are operating; and, while in some places they are new and have not got down to a satisfactory basis just yet, nevertheless we know that they are on the way to satisfactory operation. Therefore I do not think the gentleman who spoke should be particularly worried for the retail workers; the matter should not cause him such great concern.

Another point was raised, namely, the student-worker. That question has been dealt with in other countries. The principle of the minimum wage for women having been established, these other difficulties will melt away when the necessary work is undertaken by the various commissions or committees that may be appointed. We are at last, I think, arriving at a common conclusion. I stated when I came here that I was very hopeful of this Conference, and that hope I think is justified, because conditions are beginning to look very much brighter, and I think we are in agreement at the present time.

I therefore second the motion, Mr. Chairman, that the matter go to the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

ORGANIZATION OF LABOUR

DISCUSSION ON THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE, RECOGNITION OF LABOUR UNIONS, AND THE RIGHT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.

The Conference proceeded to the consideration of the fourth item of the agenda, namely:

4. Consideration of:
(a) employees' right to organize;
(b) recognition of labour unions;
(c) the right of employees to collective bargaining.

The CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding with this item, which is subdivided into three heads, I should like the sense of the meeting as to whether I am to allow thirty minutes on each subhead or thirty minutes on the whole subject.

Mr. R. A. RIGG: My understanding is that it is to be thirty minutes on each subject for each side.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW: Each subhead.

Mr. R. A. RIGG: I would understand, Mr. Chairman, not that there is to be an hour and a half given to each side on this question, but half an hour to the introduction of the whole item.

Mr. A. MUNRO GRIER: Ten minutes for each subhead?

Mr. R. A. RIGG: I do not know how the matter has been arranged; but I would have assumed that the whole of the three phases of this one question would have been dealt with in that fashion, and that one person would have been appointed to introduce the whole matter. However, it is for the convention to decide.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW: We distinctly understood, Mr. Chairman, that we should be entitled to thirty minutes in opening and ten minutes on each of the subheads, a, b, and c, and have arranged our data accordingly. We think the importance of each of these subjects necessitates that length of time to do it justice. It would be impossible to treat them all under one head.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Mr. Chairman, in reading over the report of the committee it will be seen that it distinctly says for "each item on the agenda." I take it that if the preliminary committee had intended to allow half an hour for each of the subheads they would have numbered them 4, 5 and 6, instead of making them a, b, and c, under number 4.

We feel that it is necessary to give full consideration to every question; but at the same time, if this Conference is not to be abortive and is not to be talked out and made useless, it is essential that in addition to discussing these matters we should declare ourselves by resolution and vote. If we take half an hour for each subhead, and deal with item number 5 in the same way, realizing that it is now Wednesday afternoon, it appears to me that on Saturday we will be discussing the reference to the committees, instead of reaching any conclusion. Though it is quite possible to take up an hour in discussing each of these subjects, we on this side of the House are prepared to accept them as one subject because of their interlocking nature—the right to organize carrying with it the recognition of trades unions, and the right of the employees to collective bargaining. As I say we think they might well be dealt with together, and, if necessary, I will move accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not believe the motion is necessary, because in the report submitted to the Conference the final paragraph reads as follows:

Speeches. That after the conclusion of the addresses already arranged for on the opening day by the Right Honourable Sir R. L. Borden, the Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Colonel D. Carnegie of London, England, and Mr. W. Jett Lauck of Washington, D. C., in respect of each item on the agenda, the employers' and employees' groups shall each be entitled to select a speaker to lead in the presentation of their views, and that these speakers shall be entitled to speak for thirty minutes in opening the discussion.

My interpretation is that these items are numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and so on, and that the subject which we are now taking up is item number 4. Unless you agree between you to adopt thirty minutes for each subhead, my decision is that it is thirty minutes for all.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW: Of course, we will dispose of subhead a in 30 minutes, and I would suggest that we take 15 minutes for the first question, and thirty minutes for each of the other two.

Mr. TOM MOORE: I think that, by the adoption of our agreement of alternating, in view of the recommendation of the Chairman, we had better proceed and open the case on one side, which we will do in thirty minutes. The opposite side can then take their turn of thirty minutes, and anything left unsaid can be delegated, as Mr. Grier said his whole brief had been, to some other persons who can present it in the ten minute intervals. I think we will then get the whole matter

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW: In view of the fact that we have so long been manufacturing specialties, we have these matters subdivided. We have a chief speaker on each subheading, and I am afraid that we will not make much progress; but we have to abide by your ruling.

Mr. JAMES SIMPSON: May I point out that Item Number 6 on the agenda includes five subjects. If you devote half an hour to each subject, the introduction alone will occupy two hours and a half.

Mr. W. L. BEST: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: It is unfortunate for me and perhaps for you that I understood this matter would not come up until to-morrow, and that the few notes I had prepared upon the subject are in my office. However, notwithstanding the largeness of the subject which has been assigned to me for introduction, a subject embracing perhaps three of the most important matters to be considered by this Conference, and upon which all of the others depend for their recognition and solution, I will endeavour to take not much more than the thirty minutes to deal with it.

The first item, of the employees right to organize has been so splendidly emphasized by the speakers in the introductory remarks to this Conference that there is little for me to specially emphasize as to the importance of the recognition of the principle of the right of men to associate themselves together for lawful purposes.

In addition to the emphasis that has been given, not only in the splendid address that was submitted to us here from the Prime Minister, whose absence we all regretted, but the equally strong emphasis that was placed upon the question by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King) in his address, the principle has been recognized by one of the greatest Conferences that the world has ever known, the Conference at which the famous Peace Treaty was formulated and signed. We can therefore consider this matter not only from the viewpoint of a local and a national, but of a world-wide significance.

The declaration that was made in the Treaty of Peace is so well known to every one that it does not require any great emphasis from me at this time, because every one who knows anything of the value of organization will have caught the significance of the time and place at which that declaration was made in that famous document, and the enunciation of those principles which are contained in the famous Treaty of Peace. But coming nearer home, we find that the Government of the Dominion of Canada, in July, 1918, not only made a similar declaration as to the right of employees to organize, but they subsequently passed an Order in Council fixing a penalty on any employer who discriminated against any employee because of his affiliation with a labour organization.

That being so, we come down to the question whether we, in times like these, should adopt the principle not only in the interest of industrial development, but as a national measure, because we have heard from several speakers that the matters which we are discussing and considering at this Conference are of national importance rather than of local moment. To that I can very readily subscribe. I think any one possessed of any measure of the sense of responsibility which every Canadian citizen should have must feel that into whatever field of human activity we enter, the right of bodies of men to associate themselves together should be recognized so long as the purpose for which they associate is not in conflict with constituted government and authority. That seems such a British-like principle that I think a person who opposed it in a time like this, viewing it in the light of recent events, both local, national and world-wide, should find himself in an isolated minority.

But some one may ask, and rightly ask, has there been any value in organization, and especially in organized labour? Well, it would take too long to tell you of all the humanitarian things that organized labour, through its various units have done. One of the organizations, with which I am more familiar, had for its inception motives which, as I think you will agree, were decidedly humanitarian. The scene was laid in the state of New York over 40 years ago. A locomotive fireman in the performance of his duty was scalded to death. A few of his co-workers, finding that his widow and fatherless children were left entirely destitute, to be a charge upon the community, were seized with the importance of doing something as a class to protect the dependents of their fellow who had been taken away so untimely; and forthwith that organization had its birth, and since that time it has grown until it has now a membership of something like 120,000 members on the continent, and over $6,000,000 in its funds. It has contributed hundreds of millions of dollars during that period to widows and orphans; its contribution was over 10,000 members to the great war; and as a result of the devastating effects of the war it has

expended almost two millions of dollars. That is only one of numerous cases that could be mentioned by men who are sitting in this Chamber from the various classes of organized labour.

I do not believe it is necessary that I should dwell too long on these points because, as I said in the beginning, the right of association of men for lawful purposes—and I use the term that was recognized in the Peace Treaty, "for lawful purposes"—is so obvious in this country that it absolutely needs no elaboration; and from the viewpoint of the responsibility of citizenship and the principles upon which all British institutions are founded, we cannot conceive of any one, in the light of recent events, taking the position now that persons should not organize.

I heartily subscribe to some observations that were made by speakers, that we should not impute to other people anything but honourable motives; and when an individual or a corporation or a government objects to a body of Canadian citizens organizing, they are imputing to them motives which are dishonourable, and which perhaps are unlawful; they are anticipating their motives, and if they are not, why the objection?

Now, these are pointed statements; they are frank statements, made with all candour, with equal kindness, and because I am a firm believer that the recognition of the right to organize, the recognition of the union after it is organized, and the right to collective bargaining with the employer for the wages which the workman shall receive for his employment, are so closely interlocked and so absolutely essential not only to industrial development but to industrial peace and national harmony that we cannot dissociate them at all.

Taking up the second point, recognition of the union, admitting that it is the right of an association of men or women to organize, then it follows, from a business point of view, that it is the business method for employers to meet their employees, especially where large bodies of men are employed. That seems so simple that I think it does not need very much elaboration. It may be quite practicable for an individual employer to confer from time to time with a number of his employees, but with a large corporation—and our commercial and industrial life is developing on a larger scale all the time—it is impracticable for an employer to meet all the men who may be engaged with a great corporation. Therefore a practical businesslike method of dealing in a collective way with those men, and learning how they are getting along, is something in which a corporation is directly interested. It is very much easier to approach the employees in any industry through some one who is officially selected by them, just as it might be by the manufacturers or some other equally large corporation to present their views on an important matter to a body such as the Board of Railway Commissioners or other organization dealing with matters in which they are vitally concerned.

Collective bargaining has been defined by the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations in paragraph 62, page 19 of their Report, as follows:

> 62. Collective bargaining is a term which implies the right of workers to group themselves together for the purpose of selling their labour power collectively to their employer instead of making individual agreements. It is sometimes carried on by an employer and a committee of his employees. To make this effective on the side of the workers, men have organized themselves into Trade Unions, and many of these are again federated into central councils such as the Building Trades Council, Metal Trades Council, etc. Employers in a like manner sometimes control one factory, sometimes a chain of factories, and in more instances have organized into larger associations of the industry to which they particularly belong. These associations have again in some instances become part of federations such as the National Association of Building Contractors and Supply Men, with local branches in many of the larger cities, and many other similar groups.

That is the definition which the Royal Commission has given to us. Some one may rightfully ask: "But has collective bargaining been tried? Has it really been a success?" Well, I think it has. There are perhaps representatives here from the various trades where the principle has been recognized and where it has been tried out. In the industry with which I have been more familiar for over a quarter of a century—the railway industry—it has been tried out with very marked success. I believe the public is quite well aware of the method of collective bargaining that has been in force and effectively carried out on the railroads, at least the larger railway lines, of the entire North American continent. It did not come all in a day. There was a time when railway companies not only prevented the organizing of men in groups, but they refused to recognize them or collectively bargain with them; but the railway companies that take that position now are so far in the minority that we scarcely know of them. To-day the railway companies are all, I may say, collectively

meeting with the great majority of their employees through the accredited representatives of their employees who are organized, and in that way they are not only working out good business for the industry itself and for the employees themselves, but are also ensuring uninterrupted service in the great and important industry of transportation in this country. Those of you who have watched the results of what has been accomplished by the Canadian Railway Board of Adjustment No. 1, though formed quite late in the war, cannot help but be impressed with the great value that that has been, not only to the people who were represented around the common table by the twelve men who gathered there, and to every industry—shall I say—in the Dominion of Canada which was of any importance and was depending on the rail transportation of the country, but also from the national viewpoint, especially at a time when Canada was bending every effort to assist the Motherland and the Allied nations in the titanic struggle which we are so glad has culminated in the signing of the Peace Treaty.

Now, just briefly, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a statement, and I desire to make it in all kindness and frankness, too, with regard to the Treaty itself, which contains practically all these principles. In this very Chamber, the Senate of Canada ratified that Treaty. Under this same roof the elected representatives of the citizens of Canada have ratified it. In what realm does an individual employer of labour, or a corporation, or a Government, place itself when it denies the right of men and women employees, no matter for what purpose so long as it is lawful, to organize? I ask, in what position does it place itself? That is a question that you and I have to face. The success of the industrial, commercial and national development of Canada, and, more than all, the welfare of the citizenship of Canada, I believe, centre upon the recognition by the employers of labour and the Governments of Canada of these principles, more than upon any other thing that I know of; and let me say, too, that in my judgment failure to carry out these principles effectively and as far as practicable cannot but foster unhappiness, discontent, social, and industrial unrest, none of which a lover of human liberty wants to see in a country such as ours, or in any country. The workers, or the representatives of the workers' group, feel, and feel very strongly, that these principles should be taken into the most serious consideration—perhaps they have been—by the employers' representatives here, and that they should make at this Conference some declaration as to the policy or attitude of the employers in this country on the question of the right of their workpeople to organize, on the question of recognizing them after they are organized, and on the question whether the employers are willing to bargain collectively with the employees through constituted committees representing them, as outlined in the definition of the term "Collective Bargaining."

And may I refer to the splendid and instructive address that was given to us by Col. Carnegie? If any of the representatives of industry here, or any of the representatives of provincial or federal governments, have in mind the organization of industrial councils, they have appreciated the point that Col. Carnegie made regarding the importance of first organizing the employees in order effectively to form the council and consequently to deal effectively with the employees in the respective industries. It all seems so plain to a person who entirely discards personal feeling in the matter, who looks, as I am so glad has been suggested, above the class interest of either side of the House, and considers the interest of the industrial and commercial development of the country and the good of the whole people of Canada.

I do not know that the declaration of policy on these three questions would be sufficient for all the employees in all the classes of industry in Canada. I believe it would be sufficient for a number of classes, and I am free to say to you that the representatives of the larger number of classes of employees, at this Conference, feel that some legislation should be passed in order to insure the adoption of these proposals. I am not going to discuss that point. There will perhaps be some who will follow me and will take up the reasons why this should be done. It is not my purpose to dwell on them. Those of you who have observed recent events in Canada will know of, and will perhaps be able to cite, instances which have emphasized the importnace of legislation in this regard. Personally—and I am speaking personally in the matter—I think it would be well if it were not necessary to do that. Nevertheless, as I have already pointed out, the majority of the representatives here of the various classes of workmen throughout Canada feel that, in the light of what has taken place, it would perhaps be better for

the Government, not by Order in Council, but by some legislative enactment, to make this declaration of policy, and that if it is necessary the provincial governments should do likewise.

I believe my time is just about up, Mr. Chairman. I might have made a more intelligent presentation if I had not forgotten my notes, but I am not going to make any apologies; that is not your fault. You have been exceedingly patient, and I thank you for your attentive hearing.

Mr. S. R. PARSONS (Toronto): This particular subject is divided into three special headings, and we on our side of the House understood that under each heading the speaker would be allowed half an hour, but as your ruling makes that impossible, I would ask that, if it meets with your pleasure and the pleasure of the House, the speakers who are to introduce the various subjects be given a total time of half an hour of which I will take only two or three minutes. I hope you will be somewhat lenient with my colleagues, who have the more important parts of the subject to deal with, and who may trespass a few minutes longer upon your time.

The subject which I will present to you is the employees' right to organize. There can be no question, Mr. Chairman, as to this. It is already set forth in legislation passed by the Dominion Government, and is repeated in various Acts. When the Labour Board of Appeal, of which I was a member, was appointed, about a year ago, it was set forth in the order that in the Dominion of Canada there were two classes of employees engaged in the various industries—those who belonged to the labour unions and those who did not—and that there should be no discrimination whatever as between these classes. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted that there can be no discussion as to the right of employees to organize. One might be tempted to say a good deal on this subject if there were a little more time, but I shall confine myself to a short brief, especially as I trespassed upon your time this morning with some general statements.

The right of general association for any lawful purpose cannot be called in question, as witness societies, churches and business organizations, whether incorporated or unincorporated.

The right of an employee to join a union no one disputes, and this also involves the right of any employee not to join without fear of coercion, oppression or threat.

No one questions the right of union organizers to attempt to secure, in all lawful ways, her membership, employees of any shop, but that does not take away the right of the employer to maintain an open shop. In no case can employers sanction any method of organization where threats persecution or any improper pressure are exercised or any discrimination is involved in the treatment of employees, whether they are organized or not.

Mr. C. H. CARLISLE (Toronto): I was very much impressed by the manner in which the speaker on the opposite side presented his subject. I think that he was not speaking for effect, but was saying that which he felt. I think that the employer and the employed are equally interested in bringing about the best conditions for both capital and labour. It now remains to work out a plan that shall give us the results that each is striving to attain. It would be really surprising if we could see things always in the same light. What may seem justice to one may not seem justice to the other.

I was assigned the subject of recognition of unions. I have made some notes on this subject and will read them. I have taken occasion to criticise frankly the things in labour unions that I think are not beneficial either to the workpeople or to the state. In offering these criticisms I am doing so, I think, with the same purpose in view as the gentleman who spoke from the other side.

On page 11 of the Report of the Commission to Inquire into Industrial Relations in Canada, section 39, the report states:

"Not only should employers be accorded the right of organizing, but the prudent employer will recognize such organization, and will deal with the duly accredited representatives thereof in all matters relative to the interests of the employees, when it is sufficiently established to be fairly representative of them all."

While stating that the prudent employer will recognize such organization, the commission in no way defines the organization or gives qualifications of membership of the organization which it recommends should be recognized.

I believe the labour organizations in Canada to-day group themselves into three main classes, namely:

1. Those embraced in the Trades and Labour Congress, which are affiliated with the American Federation of Labour;

2. Those embraced in the Canadian Federation of Labour, which have no international affiliations; and

3. Those sometimes known as the One Big Union, sometimes as the Industrial Workers of the World, whose doctrine is syndicalism.

The employer could scarcely recognize all of these organizations on account of their conflicting purposes and demands. These organizations do not fully agree with each other, and, in fact, each one has a great deal of criticism to offer to the principles and aims of the other. It would greatly clarify the situation for us if the commission would say whether they wish recognition accorded to every organization claiming to be a labour union, including, for example, recognition of the One Big Union, or whether they would prefer us to recognize only such unions as are embraced within the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, remembering always that the latter course would mean repudiation by us of the only labour unions we have which are not dominated by the American Federation of Labour.

In determining this question of recognition, it would seem essential to give consideration to the responsibility of the union asking for such recognition, but the commission does not intimate what responsibility the organization should have before it receives the recognition of the prudent employer. Before any organization has the right of recognition, it should first comply with the highest interests of society or state in which it operates. This is the test which is applied in all forms of business, such as banking, merchandising and manufacturing.

In all lines of business which materially affect the public, the rights and privileges of these businesses are limited and defined either by incorporation or registration, the interests of society being thereby safeguarded. The State has deemed this a necessary precaution. Why should unions ask for recognition until they have complied with the fundamentals required by society of other classes of organizations? Social or commercial power cannot exist to the betterment of society as a whole without a corresponding moral and legal responsibility. No organization of employers or employees is entitled to social or individual recognition that refuses to accept responsibility commensurate with its activity. This is fundamental, and no form of association, be it that of employers or employees, has a right to exist without willingness to live within the law and under the law.

An agreement entered into in perfectly good faith by an industrial corporation with a labour union can be enforced as against the corporation, because the corporation is legally responsible, but the labour union may, if it so desires, and as it has done, disregard and violate that agreement without laying itself open to action under any process of law, simply because it is without a legal status.

The next essential to recognition should be confidence. When a body has become legally organized and has established its responsibility, it must win public confidence and create reputation if it is to exist over a period of time. It gives me great pleasure to admit that some labour unions have a record of honouring their agreements, which is much to their credit, and which surely entitles them to the confidence they to-day enjoy; but I question if any advocate of labour unions could claim on behalf of organized labour generally, that its record in the matter of agreements, consideration of the public interests, and respect for law and order, has been such as to justify the confidence so indispensible to the recognition now asked.

As though to make its situation doubly secure, and to provide itself with a second line of defence against those who might seek to force responsibility upon it, organized labour has succeeded in having itself exempted from the operation of those statutes that deal with conspiracy. Under the Criminal Code business men and business organizations that conspire together for the purpose of restraining trade in any way, are declared to be acting unlawfully and are subject to heavy penalties. That is as it should be, for society must be protected. Yet the very clause dealing with this matter carries a proviso which is nothing less than a license to labour organizations to conspire against the public interests, without rendering themselves liable to the penalties which attach to business men for similar actions.

If labour unions, without official recognition, will use their influence to secure the passage of such questionable legislation, what are we to expect from labour unions after we have accorded them recognition and thus added to their prestige and influence? Would it not be fair, as a prerequisite to any consideration of this matter, to say to organized labour that it must not merely assume its full legal and moral responsibilities, but that it must surrender exemptions that have been improperly conceded to it, before other classes of society, that are responsible and that

enjoy no exemptions, can possibly grant it the recognition it demands.

In all forms of public service the interests of the public are paramount. These interests required that the right of combination by labour shall be limited in such a way that continuity of operation and performance will never be interrupted. Events in Canada during the past year have demonstrated over and over again that combinations of labour have been allowed to grow up in our midst which not only menace various forms of public service, but which have not hesitated upon occasion actually to paralyze such services in order to enforce their demands. The request proffered here to-day for recognition is no doubt meant to include the recognition of unions that have shown their utter disregard of the rights of society by calling affiliated unions out on sympathetic strikes. Is recognition now to be given as the reward of such action? If not, is it to be given as the price society must pay to secure immunity from such action from this time on? Or, shall we withhold recognition until such unions have shown that they are able and willing to govern themselves in harmony with the best interests of society?

Experience and history conclusively prove that great combinations or organizations whose object is selfish and personal have operated to the detriment of society. This is true whether the combination be social, commercial, or political. As to States, we have only to refer to the Persians under Xerxes; the Roman Empire; the French under Louis XIV. and under Napoleon; and the Germans under the Kaiser.

Most countries have recognized the danger of large combinations of capital when controlled and employed for selfish purposes, and have legislated against them. The same thing must surely hold true in social organizations whose basic interests are naturally personal or selfish. It would appear that a government could not do a greater injustice to its subjects than to permit the creation of large and selfish interests, which would be free to work for the attainment of their ends, regardless of the damage that might result to other members of the body politic.

If it be suggested by the Commission that union recognition is to result in employers dealing with organized labour to the exclusion of unorganized labour, it is immediately the denial to the great majority of Canada's working population of the opportunity to work except under the license of a labour union. The promotion of such an object cannot possibly be a proper function of any government. No government could afford for one moment to tolerate such a condition. It only needed the display, upon the milk wagons of Winnipeg, of cards bearing the inscription "By permission of strike committee" to bring home to the people of that city the tyrannical significance of the closed shop.

Union recognition may not directly or immediately involve the principle of the closed shop, but union recognition has always been the first step towards the acceptance of that principle where it is observed to-day. It is fair to assume, therefore, that indirectly and eventually union recognition does mean the closed shop. That in turn means the surrender by the individual of his right of self-determination, it means the denial of his God-given right to sell his labour where he chooses, to whom he chooses and for what he chooses; rights in which he must be protected unless we are all prepared to relinquish our present system of government for one of pure socialism.

Undoubtedly the object of organized labour is for the betterment of its members, the wage earners. I would not question the sincerity of the belief of those who belong to it. If the principles and purposes of organized labour tend to the betterment of the wage earner and to the betterment of the State, then organized labour is to be commended, and should receive the support of the State. It is quite evident, however, that the great masses of workers do not share the beliefs held by organized labour. As I understand it, only about 15 or 18 per cent of the wage earners of Canada or the United States are members of labour organizations. If labour in general believed in the success of the principles of organized labour, there surely could not be such a percentage standing aloof from it. So long as nearly 85 or 90 per cent of labour does stand aloof, on what possible ground could employers justify their recognition of so small a minority, and people therewith a refusal to deal with an overwhelming majority.

England, for a great number of years, has been a highly organized labour nation, a nation where the measures of recognition accorded to labour unions is far beyond anything that has ever been granted in Canada. The result of this organization and recognition has not shown that the English wage earner has been or is in a better or more advanced condition than the wage earner of nations such as Canada and the

United States that have only a small percentage of their working forces organized. I doubt if any one would contend that the conditions of the English wage earner are anything like as comfortable or as prosperous as those of the wage earner in this country. Neither can you argue for the English organizations, that they have allayed in any degree industrial unrest as it is a well-known fact that just prior to the outbreak of the war English labour was in an extreme state of unrest, perhaps to a degree not equalled at any time in the history of that country.

Australia furnishes another striking example of the questionable benefits accruing to society from the general recognition of labour unions. In no other country in the world have the principles of organized labour been given a wider application than in Australia. The statute books of that country are replete with legislation of the most advanced labour type, much of which was passed under the ægis of a labour government. Yet who will say that the experiences of Australia have been of a kind to encourage Canada to follow in the same path, particularly when it is fresh in the minds of all of us that only a few days have elapsed since Australia was in the throes of a shipping strike which for six weeks practically isolated that country from outside communication.

Labour organizations have not yet proven that they are able to control the operations of their members. It is quite well known that acts of violence have been committed, such as destruction of property, even destruction of life. We do not believe nor do we suggest that such acts of violence are the purpose of organized labour, or that they are committed with the consent of organized labour. All we say is that the commission of such acts proves a lack of control. Lack of control is again shown in the breaking of agreements. While this may not be in accordance with the wishes of those who manage the organization, the condition exists, which probably would not exist if labour organizations were to safeguard themselves by insisting upon a proper qualification for membership.

Provided such qualifications were always insisted upon, and provided it were known by the public that the personnel and the activities of labour unions were thus being safeguarded, it would promote their welfare and their recognition, and there would be some ground for the belief that every demand put forward in the name of organized labour should receive the consideration of the employer.

There seems much to be done in organized labour before it can fully command the hearty co-operation of the State.

The highest purpose of this Conference should be to contend, not for selfish purposes for either the employer or the employee, but for such principles as tend to build a more harmonious, a more progressive and a better Dominion. Labour can never raise to a higher level than that which the nation permits. This is equally true of capital. The employer and employee have much in common. They should have much in co-operation, and aid each other to achieve the best. The demands of either should be reasonable and fair, and should always have in mind the interests of the citizens at large.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW (Woodstock): Mr. President and fellow delegates: I must admit that my personal experience of unionism and labour organizations is very limited. I have the honour to be the head of an organization employing a number of men in different localities. The men in none of our plants are organized, and I have never had any direct dealings with the representatives of labour unions. I have discussed the matter casually with representatives of the workmen in our different works, but I have never found that they had any inclination to join the unions. In fact, on the other hand, I have found rather a distinct disinclination on the part of the men to associate themselves with unionism.

I know a determined effort was made in the city of Woodstock to organize the woodworkers in that city. I am not in the counsels of the labour unions, but I think I am within the mark in saying that the attempt was a distinct failure, notwithstanding that an advertisement was put in the papers offering that if the men would come on and join to-day the fees would be cut in two. I believe, however, that no very great harm would come to us or to our men if they decided of their own accord to become union men. I have nothing against unionism, and I have some very good friends on the other side of the House. I had occasion to be associated with two of them at least in dealing with a matter outside of our own plant. I found them reasonable men, as reasonable men as I ever met.

In view of the fact that 90 per cent of the labourers of this country are not union men, and as far as we can see at present they do not desire to become such, I do not think that any legislation should be put on the statute books that would affect the position of this large majority.

The report of the Royal Commission, which I have read very carefully, was based upon evidence collected when they made an itinerary through this country, stopping at various places, and hearing what individuals who desired to go before them had to say. My own observation was that the most responsible men amongst the workers and the employers did not bother their heads about going before the Commission. They did not want to go there and waste their time by hearing a lot of nonsense talked by a lot of wind-bags—because more wind-bags went before the Commission than anything else. I believe that if that Commission had been composed of men of more experience in labour matters, not lawyers, with power to take evidence, a report might have been produced that would have been of some value to us. The report as we have it to-day does not take into consideration the economic effect of the suggestions made by the Commission. That is the main objection I have to it. There are also recommendations made, which we are taking up item by item, which if carried out would lead us on the road to ruin. However, I am possibly diverting by talking too much about the report in general, and must confine myself to Item No. 4. As stated by the first speaker, we concede the right of men to organize, but we do not think that any legislation should be passed that compels the recognition of a labour union. The right to organize, which is interpreted as the right of the workers to join unions, is a general right which no one disputes; it is merely part of the individual right of contract. The right to join a union, however, presumes and involves the right not to join a union, and unless free choice in the matter is preserved, the right is denied, and ceases. Now, I do not want to put in a false position the 90 per cent of the men in this country who do not desire to join a union. The right to organize, meaning thereby the right of a worker to join another group of workers, is quite a different thing from the right of a union to undertake a deliberate and systematic campaign to organize an establishment where existing conditions are peaceable and satisfactory. This involves general stimulation of discontent and unrest which did not previously exist, and the purpose is not to serve or protect the workers in the establishment so much as to undertake such a campaign with no greater or more sacred right than the right of the employers to maintain their status with their employees. That is our desire, and I believe those are the conditions of 85 to 90 per cent of the employees in this country. It is also entirely proper to ask that labour unions, in seeking recognition, should conform to ordinary business standards. That point was emphasized by Mr Carlisle. They should accept legal responsibility for their acts and their contract. There is no warrant that in dealing with organized labour we will not prejudice the position of the men who are not union men. Unionism which recognizes merit and efficiency, as I believe it does, and insists upon high standards, will have no trouble in securing recognition and should not demand a monopoly. Such a union should have something desirable to exchange. The general policy of recognition of all unions, irrespective of their character and policies, would be unwise and disastrous at the present time, in my opinion. It would take away the incentive for the development and growth of unions along proper lines, and put a premium upon bad unionism.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Mellroth): Hon. Mr. MacGregor, of Nova Scotia, desires the privilege of asking a question.

Hon. Mr. MacGREGOR: Yesterday the Hon. Mr. Dunning stated, I think very clearly, the position of those of us who represent provincial Governments. We may be, and we doubtless shall be, asked to legislate on some of the matters that are being dealt with. For that reason we are anxious to get as much light as we possibly can. Now, my friend Mr. Best, towards the close of his very admirable address in which he opened the discussion on compulsory recognition of trade unions, hinted—nay, I think he stated—that it might be necessary to come to the legislature and ask for legislation in respect to this compulsory recognition. This is not a new question with us in the province of Nova Scotia; we have had it before the Government and before committees of the legislature for a number of years. However, we were confronted with this difficulty, that the trades unionists in Nova Scotia were not at one as to whether they desired compulsory recognition by law or not. What I would like to know—and I am asking the question in absolute sincerity—is this, whether those who are here representing most of the unions, I take it, throughout the whole of Canada, are agreed that if recognition cannot be got in any other way it should be by compulsory legislative enactment? Because we have had very prominent trade unionists who have opposed

legislation on this subject on the broad ground. I think, that if they were not able to show to the employer that their union was a good thing both for the employer and for the employed they did not wish to bring about recognition by legislative compulsion. I am anxious to know whether the suggestion of Mr. Best is thoroughly endorsed by organized labour throughout Canada.

My second question arises out of the first, or is rather a corollary to it—and I am again dealing with a condition which we found in the same province of Nova Scotia. It is this. Some of our industries have not only recognized the trades unions voluntarily, but they have gone further and stopped the dues or collected the dues of the members in the office, and we have been asked at one time or another to legislate on this subject also. My second question, then, would be: whether, in the event of asking for compulsory recognition of trades unions by law, that implies or suggests as a corollary that along with it would go the collection of dues or the stoppage of dues in the office of the employers?

Those are the two questions that I ask in all sincerity, and would request some ladies or gentlemen, who speak on behalf of organized labour, to deal with them to-day or to-morrow morning.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Just briefly I might state that the statements made by Mr. Best are endorsed by the labour representatives to this Conference, and I believe represent the thoughts of those with whom they are closely connected throughout the Dominion of Canada. The rest of the questions will undoubtedly be dealt with fully by the labour delegates in the remainder of the debate, and I think you need have no hesitation in being assured that the workers desire protection through legislation against discrimination for joining unions; they desire legal protection of that right which has been conceded to us. The other questions will be answered during the debate.

The CHAIRMAN: Among those attending this Conference is Mr. Stephen T. Early of Washington, D.C., on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I am sure I am expressing the wish of the Conference in extending a warm welcome to Mr. Early on its behalf.

The Conference adjourned until to-morrow at 10 a.m.

CANADA

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

of Dominion and Provincial Governments with Representative Employers and Labour Men at Ottawa, September, 1919.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

FOURTH DAY.

CONTENTS.

Press Reports of the Conference—Misleading Headlines — Statement and Request of the Chairman.

Organization of Labour—Further Discussion on the Right to Organize, Recognition of Unions, and the Right of Collective Bargaining—The question referred to Committee.

Addresses by A. C. Hay, A. B. Weeks, R. A. Rigg, Dr. D. Strachan, J. H. Kennedy, E. G. Henderson, C. H. Grant, Sir John W. Willison, J. P. Anglin, Arthur Roberts, W. L. Best, F. P. Jones, J. S. McKinnon.

Industrial Labour Laws—Report of Committee, with Recommendations—Adopted Unanimously.

Manufacturing Profits in Canada—Correction of Mis-statement by a Delegate and in the Press.

Message from Church Synod—Resolution Passed by the Church of England Synod of Ontario.

Joint Industrial Councils—Discussion—The question referred to Committee.

Addresses by Dr. D. Strachan, Tom Moore, Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, A. C. Hay, Wills Maclachlan.

Decision to refer Remaining Subjects on Agenda to Committees without Discussion.

The Senate Chamber,

Ottawa, Thursday, September 18, 1919.

MORNING SESSION.

The Conference met at 10 a.m., Hon. Senator Gideon D. Robertson, Minister of Labour, presiding.

Mr. Gerald H. Brown acted as Secretary.

As substitutes for delegates whose names were printed in the report of the first day's proceedings the following were present today:

G. M. Murray, Ottawa, Ont., for H. M. McGregor, Ford, Ont., for the employers.

Captain A. C. Wallace, for A. W. Burnett, Vancouver, for the employers.

Wm. Martin, for Blake Wilson, for the employers.

Mr. J. T. Bourbonnière, of Montreal, representing electric railway employees, reported attendance at the afternoon session.

PRESS REPORTS OF THE CONFERENCE.

MISLEADING HEADLINES — STATEMENT AND REQUEST OF THE CHAIRMAN.

The CHAIRMAN: Before proceeding with the agenda there are a few little items to which it has been suggested the Chair might direct attention.

One is, that Committees in making their reports to the Conference should have them in triplicate, at least, so that one copy of the report might be immediately handed to the Hansard reporters and then to the press. This will facilitate the work in connection with the record of the Conference, and also assist the press in the publicity they are endeavouring to give us.

Another request made is that speakers do the best they can to make themselves heard throughout the room. It has also been suggested that speakers who quote figures or read from documents should immediately file a copy of such documents and figures with the Secretary. This will assist in completing the record.

Mr. Shaw called attention the other day to the undesirability of wrong impressions being given out to the public through the press. I feel compelled to appeal this morning to the press generally in relation to the headings that appear in some of our papers. While I am happy to say that the information contained in the detailed reports is fairly accurate—and I think the press are to be congratulated and commended for their efforts to give a detailed account of the Conference affairs—yet the gentlemen who prepare the headlines for the newspapers are misleading the people of this country as to the facts. Unfortunately, the headings are the only part of the articles which thousands of people read. Yesterday I noticed this in three of our eastern papers; and, when a man riding on a street car to work happens to glance over the shoulder of another man who has a morning paper, and sees the statement that "A ferment may break out at any time," that "This is a Winnipeg labour leader," or that "There are wide differences in the Industrial Conference, and hints of more strikes," that fellow goes down and talks the matter over with his fellow-employees in the shop, and there are always a few of them that will go home and put another coat of paint on their soapboxes, or paint another skull and cross-bones on them, and renew their determination to carry on the war which they have in their hearts, and which many of them believe is the only remedy for the solution of the problems we are considering. On the other hand, the employers who read those headlines come to the conclusion that there is a Donnybrook Fair on here at Ottawa, and that there is no possibility of a compromise or understanding. Therefore the wrong impression gets abroad, and the very spirit that this Conference was called to endeavour to suppress and try to overcome, is intensified, instead of the spirit of harmony, which I am glad to say all the delegates to this Conference are endeavouring to encourage and promote.

I want to point this out, that it costs the people of Canada $6,200,000 per year to distribute the newspapers through the postal service in this country, and that the expense to the people of the country in maintaining the postal service is approximately $6,000,000 per year in excess of the revenues derived from the newspapers for their distribution. In addition to that, the telegraph service is financially assisted; that is, the press service receives financial assistance in order that news may be carried from East to West over a large territory which is unproductive locally so far as telegraph business is concerned. That in itself is all right; but if the people of this country are contributing millions of dollars a year for the purpose of getting newspapers distributed to them so that they may have information as to the events that are occurring here and elsewhere throughout the country, they are entitled to have that information properly and correctly given to them, and not misinterpreted in the headlines of the newspapers.

I would therefore appeal to the press of Canada to co-operate with this convention—with the Government, with the employers, and with labour if you please, who are all of one accord in endeavouring to improve the spirit between employers and workmen, and are endeavouring to promote co-operation and inspire confidence and harmony in the industrial world; and I do hope that the press will in the future kindly bear this appeal in mind.

We will now take up the business where it was left off yesterday.

ORGANIZATION OF LABOUR.

FURTHER DISCUSSION ON THE RIGHT TO ORGANIZE, THE RECOGNITION OF LABOUR UNIONS, AND THE RIGHT OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING — REFERRED TO COMMITTEE.

The Conference then continued the discussion on the fourth item of the agenda, namely:

4. Consideration of:—
   (a) employees' right to organize;
   (b) recognition of labour unions;
   (c) the right of employees to collective bargaining.

Mr. A. C. HAY (Winnipeg): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and gentlemen, I am very pleased to hear the remarks of our distinguished Chairman this morning in regard to the press. I come from Winnipeg, the city that has been placed upon the map, and I do not think that my co-partner, Mr. James Winning, has got justice in the press. One paragraph referred to him as a pronounced Socialist. Now, he was president of the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council, and I was Vice-President of that Council, and I am quite sure that no member of the work-

ing class in that community would ever say that James Winning or Adam Hay were Socialists in thought, idea, or execution at any time. Mr. Chairman, I came to this Conference with the idea that this was a national question. Some of the previous speakers have talked about being born in Canada. I cannot claim that distinction; I was born in Scotland. But I came to this country in 1911, and I was here only three years when war broke out, and I went to the front with the First Canadian Contingent, and my number in the Canadian army is 684; and I am still drawing a pension from the Government for stopping some German ammunition. The point I want to make, ladies and gentlemen, is this, that I went to establish peace and democracy as an international question, and to-day I am here to establish peace and democracy as a national question.

Some speakers on the other side refer to me as a labour leader, as a delegate representing labour. That may be so, but I think I have fought for and obtained the privilege of representing Canada as a citizen of Canada. Therefore my remarks will be confined to the national question as a citizen of Canada whether I am a labour leader or representing the labour group or not; and I hope you will pardon me for being a Scotchman.

Now, coming to the question of the recognition of unions, the question of the right to organize, and the right of employees to collective bargaining, I would like just to point out that I have no antagonism against the employers in Canada. Rather, I would like to point out to those employers who are antagonistic to labour that not all the employers in Canada are antagonistic, and I wish those who have the narrow view would take the broad view and get in line with their more advanced brothers. I have heard our distinguished friend over there, Mr. John Shaw, talk about his plant, stating that his employees are not organized. Well, from a labour point of view and the labour mentality I have assimilated, I think that is an awful state of affairs. We are meeting here in harmony, and our distinguished friend across there, Mr. Monro Grier, has assimilated quite a lot of Scottish humour, and I may be pardoned for shooting out a little of it across the floor, having been born in Scotland myself.

I have in my hand a paper from which I would like to quote. I do not go back to the time of 35 years ago, when I started to work at eight years of age, and when it was necessary to provide a stool for me so that I might stand up at the bench. I live in the present and look into the future. I have in my hand a paper from which I am going to quote one little item:

> In spite of these differences the officials of the union feel that, after nearly thirty years of almost fruitless effort to win recognition by the employers in the distributive trade, it is a distinct victory to get even the principle of collective bargaining accepted by an important and representative a body as the Liverpool Chamber of Trade.

That is the Old Country, that is Great Britain. For 30 years these people have been fighting for the recognition of collective bargaining. According to our distinguished friends on the other side of the House, you need only ask for it and you get it. My experience is the opposite. But, anyhow, for thirty years, in Great Britain, one branch of industry has been fighting for that recognition of collective bargaining. I hope that we shall not have to fight thirty minutes on the floor of this House for the employers to give us that recognition. Canada is a democratic country and far-seeing. We have heard men on both sides of the House state, on the one hand, how far-seeing the employers are, and, on the other, how far-seeing the labour leaders are. Let us go on record to-day as being the most advanced and democratic country in the world by establishing the right that the employers will grant to labour of collective bargaining, which is the surest point in trades union circles to-day.

I have heard delegates on both sides of the House quote figures, and one gentleman stated that Mr. A. J. Balfour had said that statistics lie. I am not very much concerned with statistics—not as much as with actual figures—

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. A. C. HAY: That may be an Irishism, but I am Scotch; I don't see the joke. I know what hearing statistics have, but statistics would not bring me into this meeting this morning; it is with actual fact; and figures that I am concerned.

There is a little item in this newspaper in regard to a congress that has taken place in the city of Glasgow. In that city there was a meeting of labour representatives attended by 826 delegates, representing four and a half million trades unionists who are fully paid up in their organizations and in good standing. You all know that the population of Great Britain is only 45,000,000, as when our esteemed and I may say our distinguished friend from Scotland, Colonel

Carnegie, was quoting figures yesterday afternoon, I was very interested in his remarks. Any man in Scotland who is not a trades unionist —well, they do not have much use for him as a Scotchman. The item in this paper refers to Mr. Samuel Gompers and the Steel Trust over there. It says that President Wilson and Mr. Gompers " will confer at the White House to-day, and I hear that the President plans another appeal in which the Steel Trust will be rebuked for its stubborn refusal to grant collective bargaining."

When I listened to the gentlemen on the other side of the House, in language which is very entertaining if it is genuine, state that collective bargaining is only a matter of the employees asking for it—well, my experience in the labour movement is this, that we always get that consideration. But I am not here to ask for consideration. I am here to ask you gentlemen not to give us consideration, but to give us legislation to provide collective bargaining. Now, that is a very strong point.

You have all read the Industrial Commission Report; so we will leave that to one side. I understand that, being business men, you do not miss much, and as a Scotchman I assimilate everything I can get my hands on. I would like to draw your attention to the proposed agenda. On page 20, the last item in the statistics states: Mainly affecting unionism—for recognition of union—from 1901 to June 30, 1919, 2,406,870 days lost to the production of Canada by strikes for the recognition of collective bargaining. We are agreed on both sides that we want production in this country. Well, if we want to save those 2,406,870 days that are lost in strikes for the right of collective bargaining—if we are agreed on that proposition, then we have done something nationally for the Dominion of Canada, which we are all, in our hearts, eager to see the first nation in this world.

I mentioned previously that I was born in Scotland. I got a living in Scotland, but I never fell out with the living I got in Canada. I want to see better conditions. The country that I have adopted has adopted me, and I am willing to give my health and my strength and my intelligence to further the Canadian cause; for my children are all born in Canada and when they get to womanhood and manhood and ask me, "What did you do for Canada?" I shall be able to show them in black and white that I was a useful citizen and that my intellect did not lie dormant.

I am very much impressed by the language used by our friends of the opposition as we term them—but I do not think that term "opposition" will be used much longer, because when I look into the faces of the intellectual business men of the Dominion of Canada I have hope. I do not like to argue the point with the man who is always telling you he is a self-made man, that he started out to work 35 hours or 24 hours a day, on, and so forth. I believe the iron hat penetrated his soul, and his intelligence has lost its place. I believe in the man who will say this much: "I started in business to improve the conditions in the factory; I started competition to give the workers a better opportunity; I started in business, not for myself alone, but in the interests of the nation of which I am a citizen." That man is a progressive individual. But the man who wants to inflict what he has suffered upon the next generation, I have no time for that individual at all. We all know perfectly well that we were born into this world under certain conditions; but do you not think, as men of honour and men of respectability, men of intelligence, that it is our duty as citizens, if we are born in a certain environment, to accomplish something to improve that environment for the benefit of future generations?

As I have already stated, I went over to the front. I never could have been conscripted because I was over age and I am not a single man. There were only three brothers in our family and they all went to the front, and one of them is lying buried in the fields of Flanders and the other two are drawing pensions; so we must have stopped some German ammunition. Now, I did not go over there to fight "for King and country," as the saying is. I went over to punish the men who betrayed the labour movement, that is, your so-called German Socialists who betrayed the British labour movement. They were nationalists fighting to force their ideas on the British Empire. We have our own ideas and there is nobody who can force his opinions on us, because we were here first and we will be here last. I do not believe in Socialism. I do not believe in the German movement, a movement that was subsidized by the German Government, a movement that was trying to chloroform the British labour leaders. They tried to catch us asleep, but as soon as they saw that the Socialists had betrayed the labour movement, we as labour men went to the front to vindicate the fact that the labour movement is British, is national, and we will fight for rightful possession and will allow no foreign

ideas to penetrate into the British Dominions of which Canada is one of the many. So I just want to impress upon you gentlemen the fact that there are no Socialists on this side of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: May I call attention to the fact that the time is up.

Mr. A. C. HAY: I thank you.

Mr. A. B. WEEKS (of Vancouver): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, we have been assembled at this Labour Conference to discuss in part the Report of the Royal Commission, and my interpretation of that is that we are here not to lay down hard and fast rules, but rather endeavour to approach the common ground on which the employer and the employee can meet. If we are successful in approaching that common ground, and if in the future structure of our industrial peace, we at this Conference lay the fundamental cornerstone of justice and equity, I think that our attendance here will have been justified.

It is not my intention, in discussing collective bargaining, to try to state an absolutely fixed, final and crystallized definition of the term. Rather would I endeavour to interpret the opinions formed after discussing this most important question with many employers. There is apparently a wide divergence of opinion in the public mind as to the true meaning of this question. If we refer to the Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, paragraph 62, we find that they tell us:

> Collective bargaining is a term which implies the right of workers to group themselves together for the purpose of selling their labour power collectively to their employer, instead of making individual agreements.

Again, in paragraph 63 we are told:

> In its simplest form collective bargaining is the negotiating for, and the reaching of, an agreement between some employer and some particular groups of employees, through their respective craft unions.

Again, in paragraph 65 we read:

> Collective bargaining is the negotiation of agreements between employers or groups of employers and employees or groups of employees, through the representatives chosen by the respective parties themselves.

In an analysis of these three definitions we find some divergence of opinion as to the scope of collective bargaining, and as to the manner of its application.

Again, the degree and character of organization and recognition of organization would appear to have an important bearing.

Mr. TOM MOORE: I rise to a point of privilege. I do not want to interfere unnecessarily, but might I ask that when any one is quoting from the Report of the Industrial Relations Committee they read the words and not give wrong impressions. The gentleman has just made a quotation which is not in harmony with the printed report of the commission relative to paragraph 62.

Mr. A. B. WEEKS: I may have made a mistake. I am not in a position to say. However, it can be corrected in the record.

In arriving at a workable definition of collective bargaining many things must be considered, primarily among which is the economic effect on our industries, in their operation and development in relation to production, which is vital to our joint welfare, and owing to the joint trust we assume on behalf of the public in our control of industry.

In paragraph 10 of the Report of the Royal Commission we read:

> The upheaval taking place throughout the world, and the state of men's minds during this critical period, make this the time for drastic changes of the industrial and social systems of Canada.

Were that worded "make this the time of drastic changes" I could well agree; but I certainly cannot agree with the wording "make this the time for drastic changes."

The Royal Commission, in paragraph 19 of their report, tell us:

> All changes should be made step by step, because we can only see a little way ahead, and each successive step should be based on the experience gained by the steps already made. At the same time we should determine the general direction in which we want to go, which should be toward the health, happiness, and prosperity of the workers, and the service of the community.

Accepting as sound logic the statements made in paragraph 19—and I believe a majority if not all Canadian employers will concur in this opinion—for our present purposes we accept and concede to the employees collective bargaining as set forth in the following definition:

Collective bargaining is the negotiation of agreements between the employer and the employees, or groups of employees, through their chosen representatives selected from among their number, based on the plant unit as the unit of production. In the selection of representatives of the employees no discrimination should be practised as between union and non-union employees.

In laying down this basic principle, if we can meet on this common ground, I believe

we have laid the foundation on which to build our future industrial structure.

Mr. R. A. RIGG (Winnipeg): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, as I have previously remarked, I regard the whole of this item as being one subject, and the subdivisions as being merely different phases of the same subject, and I shall endeavour to treat them in that manner under the broad phrase of recognition of trades union organizations.

The struggle of trades unionism for recognition is one which is more or less familiar to the minds of all who have paid the slightest attention to labour problems. It is now nearly a hundred years since the British Parliament enacted legislation legalizing trades unions. For a very considerable length of time a strenuous fight had been fought in order to secure that legislation. That was the initial defeat of the policy of laissez faire which had been built up and established by employers in connection with the relations that should exist between employers and employees so far as parliamentary activity was concerned.

From that time until now our trades unions having been legalized, and have been struggling for the right of recognition by the employers of labour. Very considerable progress has been made. We have heard of the considerable advance that has been made in respect of certain activities of labour, and we are in the fortunate position to-day of seeing organized labour occupy a place in the community which is of no mean importance and value. But, I want to call the attention of this Conference, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that this struggle for recognition has been one of the prime causes leading to industrial disturbances in this and all other industrial countries. For a decade, in the city of Winnipeg there were very, very few strikes which did not have their inception in this struggle for the recognition of organization. My experience again has been that in an effort to organize men and women into trades unions we have met at the very inception with the most hostile reception on the part of employers of labour, and when a strike has been precipitated it has been precipitated as a result of the recognition of the fact that either the organization might just as well have a life-and-death struggle then as at any other time, that sooner or later it had to come anyhow, and that in by far the larger number of cases that has been the cause of the strikes in the city of Winnipeg; and I venture to say the same is the case in all other industrial cities. But to-day we have this Conference—a recognition of trades unionism so far as this side of the House is concerned, and a very considerable step towards the attainment of our objects.

Speaking quite recently with the vice-president of one of the largest corporations in this country, and I was told that if it were possible to absolutely destroy the trades union organizations with which he and his company had to negotiate, he would not for one moment attempt to accomplish it, but that he was glad they had come into existence, that he was pleased to have their co-operation in the settlement of grievances which naturally arise between employer and employee, and that they were invaluable to the corporation.

A statement was made on the floor of this House yesterday afternoon aiming to create the impression, or at least calculated to create the impression, that our present system of organization is not one which is acceptable, and that the organizations which are affiliated with the Trades Congress of Canada are nominated by American trades unionists. I want to dissipate that idea and to assure this Conference that in the democracy of trades unionism there is no such thing as the domination of any particular section. We are a democracy, and the majority rules as far as we are concerned; and I want to say without any apology that we extend the very heartiest hand of fellowship and comradeship to our fellow-organizations south of the line, and are proud to call them "brother" in the trades union movement.

We have been told that it is the right of the individual to sell his labour, what perhaps in better terms of economics might be called his labour power, for what he pleases, where he pleases, and to whom he pleases. That is a doctrine which, if accepted, means the destruction of organization. The right of the individual has been projected during the past hundred years, in so far as the relation of employer and employee is concerned, in such a manner as to be destructive to the best interests of the employee at least, and I believe destructive to the best interests of both sides. Benjamin Franklin was infinitely nearer the mark, and as a matter of fact stated a truism, when he said very many years ago that either the workers must hang together or they must hang separately—and there has been a great deal of hanging separately going on.

We have been told that many men go out on strike because they cannot do other-

wise. I submit that the opposite is also true, that a great many men do not go out on strike, or do not organize for their mutual protection and benefit, because they dare not. The day has gone by for men to trust to others to look after their interests. Either the workers must organize in order to protect their own interests, or those interests must be sacrificed, and rightly so. Men and women were not born into this world and endowed with intelligence for the purpose of handing over the conduct and control of their affairs to other people; and I am not blaming the employing interests because they do not lie awake at night worrying over the problem of how best to protect the interests of the employees. It is the business of the employees to protect their own interests as best they may be able.

Having said that, and put it as strongly as I possibly can, I want to go further. I hold in my hands an application-for-employment form which has been submitted to the employees of the city of Winnipeg, which they have been required to sign, or were required to sign when they returned to work or sought re-employment after the strike. It says:

> I hereby agree that if I am appointed to any position in the City's service I will not join or remain a member of any Union or Association which is directly or indirectly in affiliation with any other organization to whose orders, directions or recommendations such union or association or its members are obliged or agree to observe or conform or act in concert with; that I will be governed by and observe and comply with all rules and regulations in force from time to time for the management of the department in which I may be employed, whether prescribed by the City Council or by the head of such department; that I will at all times be loyal and faithful to the city; that I will not take part in or support or favour what is known as a sympathetic strike; and that upon a breach of any of the above conditions occurring, I shall be liable to instant dismissal from the city's service

I submit that you have there a pronouncemen of policy which is out of date in these days. It is inimical to the interest not only of the employees but of the employer, and there is embodied in that document a spirit which is entirely incompatible with the interests of peace and harmony in the industrial world. I want to say that I do not believe that the life of this agreement will be lasting. I would not insult the intelligence of the Winnipeg City Council to the extent of believing that they would persist in the maintenance of an attitude of that kind. I do not believe it will last.

We have heard much pleading for a recognition of common grounds existing between us. We have been asked to think in terms of national interest. I want to ask this Conference, what are common grounds? What is national interest? I submit that if we are going to answer these questions fairly we will have to recognize the principle that the highest gifts and the fullest life are the legitimate rights of every man, woman, and child. We will have to recognize the principle that, whether we will or not, we must in some sort of way get along together. Carlyle tells us the story of an Irishwoman who wandered into a village where she did not reside. She was suffering from smallpox. She made application for admission to the institution, but was denied the right on the ground that she did not belong to that community. She wandered around, suffering from that disease, among the inhabitants of that village until she inoculated them with her own disease, and, as Carlyle very caustically remarks, proved to them that she belonged to their community. When we face the industrial unrest, with social discontent, with strikes and threats of strikes, I want to tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that you have been afflicted with a disease that you must recognize, that you must correctly diagnose, and for which you must find some adequate remedy. That is the purpose of this Conference; it is in the discovery of the fact that in the deep and vital and abiding things of life we are wonderfully alike, and not—as one gentleman on the opposite side of the House attempted to tell us, after a very elaborate argument—that everything in this world was made by the Almighty to be different. A very funny thing about that gentleman's argument was that after he had told us that everything in the world was made by the good Lord to be dissimilar, he pleaded with us to be similar. Surely our opinions were intended to be not alike if everything in the world was made to be unlike any other thing. I want to point out that while all the leaves on the trees are not alike in their appearance, they are alike in one important fundamental feature—that they must all of them obey in exactly the same way the laws that relate to their life—either that or perish. And it is the same with a community. Carlyle tells us that "this they call the organization of labour is the universal vital problem of the world." That is what we have to recognize, but what many employers in their blindness have failed completely to realize. I will go further and

say that they have not begun even to dimly discern the immense significance of what is meant by labour organization. Many of them have; I want you to note that. I am not accusing you universally. There are some employers who are tolerably up to date. There are others, however, who are out of date in their attitude: the passion to establish and maintain their businesses successfully has been the keynote of every effort they have made, and this has blinded them to the real meaning of the human interest in industry.

There has been some concern expressed here as to what the ultimate of labour organizations really is. If you will pardon me for just one moment, I will tell you the secret, Sir. I am going to spill the beans; I am going to tell you what our ultimate is, so that you may know. That is laying the cards down on the table face upward, frankly, without any reserve at all. Our ideal is that involuntary poverty, with all its concomitant diseases, shall cease. That is all. Going along with that is this—that in the construction of our common life we shall recognize the principle that all have a right to free access to everything that goes to make a full-orbed existence, that gives joy and a sense of freedom and happiness to life, and that whatever is opposed to this great fundamental principle of human existence is alien to the innate spirit of our trades union organizations, and is thereby our enemy, whatever it may be. We are not fighting men; we are fighting a system that depresses and degrades and destroys; and we are seeking to put in its place a system which builds up and glorifies and ennobles human life. We are seeking that the basis of industry shall be changed; that instead of our operating from the motives of profit-making when we make shoes, we will make shoes because people need to wear shoes; that we shall manufacture clothes because people need to be clothed. That will be the great dynamic force behind all our industrial activity; and by changing our motives for industry we will find that the interests of employer and employee as they stand at the present time have been promoted, that the best has been conserved, that the worst has been eradicated, and that we have put human life upon a new basis wherein the best there is in the world is capable of realization for all.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. D. STRACHAN (Sarnia): I represent oils, paints, and varnishes. I have observed during the course of this Conference that whenever any gentleman or lady first makes a speech it has been somewhat the custom to felicitate something or somebody. I feel as though perhaps I ought to carry out the programme. I feel like felicitating myself on the privilege of being here, and I have practically decided that I am going to be a senator, and stay in this place for the rest of my days. It is a great privilege to drop into the atmosphere of this wonderful tabernacle. Yesterday, after this House rose, I thought I would wander into the Commons and see how the commoners were settling their difficulties. But one of those policemen, who seems to be clothed with far more authority than I think he ought, stopped me and asked me who I was. I said, "I am an ex-minister, and I am now occupying a seat in the Upper Chamber." Then I explained to him, "I am a Presbyterian minister;" and he said, "Ah, well, poor fellow, you cannot help it."

I want to pay attention for a few minutes to the remarks of the last speaker on the question of collective bargaining. I am not sure that I have anything to add to what has been said to-day or yesterday. I think we have conceded collective bargaining. By the way, a remark was made the other day by one speaker, whether in the centre or on either side, as to the possibility, in perhaps near days, of some of the gentlemen on the other side coming and occupying a place on this side, as we were getting so close together and things were getting so well evened up. Whether that is the case or not I would not like to predict; but, from the atmosphere in which I have found myself during these days, and from the temperament of the men with whom I have been companioning, and the remarks that I hear from time to time, I have not the slightest doubt that some of those ladies here will be asked to come and occupy a place on this side and have something to do with the manipulating of capital as well as industry.

But I think we concede collective bargaining. I do not think it is possible to object to collective bargaining—not as a right, but as a necessity. To my mind collective bargaining has grown out of the very conditions in which we find ourselves to-day. What are those conditions? If our industries had remained as they were a few years ago, with the employer having a half-dozen or a dozen of his men around him, each of whom he knew, and the conditions of whose family life he knew, we would not be forced into these terms that have become common, and that are fairly

misunderstood at times. Collective bargaining would not then be required. But it has come as a necessity, not as a right. It has come out of the very condition of things, when our industries have grown from a hundred up to hundreds and thousands, which means that individual bargaining cannot take place; and, instead of that, we concede the right, because we recognize the necessity, of the employers of labour meeting their men in a representative way. That, to my mind, is the meaning of collective bargaining. It is not confined to wages, and anybody makes a great mistake by thinking that the great subject under consideration to-day is the question of wages. It is not that at all; it is a far bigger question. Collective bargaining is far wider; it has to do with all the conditions with which men happen to be surrounded. And how does it operate? It seems to me to operate in a very simple way, and it ought to operate in a very simple way, and that is, by the plant. I do not believe there is any other way that it can be carried on, and carried on rightly, than that the employees in the plant, whether union men or non-union men, approach the management through their regular representatives, and they sit down together around a common table. The great question is not the machinery, but the fact, of conference—that they are able to talk face to face about the things that concern not only the men, but the industry and its national worth to this country. That to my mind is the meaning of collective bargaining. Now, will that kind succeed? I want to read to you just one sentence from the employees of the corporation which I have the honour to serve. We have put into operation collective bargaining, and we bargain about everything that has to do with the shop, and this pronouncement was made after our meeting, and after the thing was fought out as man to man. The men themselves say this:

> That they further wish to express their confidence that there is no question which is likely to come up before the delegates likely to meet in future which, in their opinion, cannot be settled to the entire satisfaction of the company and the men.

That is what the representatives of over 6,000 of our employees have said after spending some months in what we believe to be the right kind of collective bargaining. Now, do you want to upset that? Do you want to introduce something else? Is that not Canadian? Is it not democratic? Is that not according to the very genius of our country—that where we are dealing with our own affairs we know our own conditions better than outsiders? You know that in the Old Country marriages are arranged by third parties and fourth parties. In this country you know how we do it: I sit on one side of the fire, and she sits on the other side of the fire, and we talk the thing over ourselves, and come to an understanding without a third or fourth party coming in. That is Canadian. A third party does not know the business, does not understand our business. I did that myself, and I brought it to a mighty successful issue, and I would advise you people to do the same thing. That is all I have to say—that I believe in collective bargaining, and I think that is a sample of it, and that that thing has succeeded.

What more is there to say? Just this: A visitor glided into our conference the other day and said that it was up to somebody to put "brother" into "brotherhood." I do not know yet what that means. A brotherhood brother is not big enough for me. I would advise that gentleman to go back a little further, to go back to the countryman of this friend across the way (Mr. Hay) and mine, and find the true definition by the man who spoke about the time

> When man to man the world o'er
> Shall brothers be, and a' that.

I would make an amendment to that gentleman's speech, and I would tell him that the time has come when it is up to somebody—and if I were permitted under the rules of this Conference to name that somebody, I would name one who is known here by the delightful name of "Tom," as somebody who I believe can do it—who would not merely put the "brother" back into "brotherhood," but would put the true idea of partnership into humanity.

J. H. KENNEDY (Toronto): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I would not presume at this time to occupy one moment of the time of this Conference were it not for the fact that I believe I have at least one concrete argument in favour of collective bargaining which is operating at the present time in a city quite adjacent to us; that is, the great commercial and manufacturing city of Montreal. I want to say that at this particular time and day that there are sitting within the sound of my voice men representing big business interests which are suffering financially and in every way because of a strike which is in progress in that city at the present time,

in what we may perhaps all consider the most vital part of our industrial system, the building trades. And I want to say, with all due respect to those who differ, that, to my mind at least, it is absolutely necessary at this time for the Government to enact legislation, though it may be objectionable to private interests, which will enable wage earners and men who are seeking to better themselves to obtain the things which money will bring to them.

Nearly a month ago, in the city of Montreal, the building trades decided to go on strike. There are men whom some gentlemen on the opposite side of the House designate as agitators, disturbers and windbags; and I can, fortunately, plead guilty. I went to that city at the instigation of the craft I represent, for the express purpose of trying to avoid that strike. I did not have to appeal to the members of my own trade or craft to organize; they were organized. I had to appeal to the employers of my craft and ask them for God's sake to let us try to get together where they could sit at one side of the table and we could sit at the other side; and if there was a difference that appeared to them insurmountable, and if after calm discussion and cool deliberation it was shown to us in any way that our demands or requests were unreasonable, the difficulties might be overcome by the method of collective bargaining. As I have said, I have no desire to take up the time of the Conference, nor would I have presumed to speak at all at this gathering were it not that I believe that there was at least one concrete fact we had to present to you in the interest of collective bargaining.

I believe that after the address of my colleague, Delegate Rigg, it is not necessary for me to elaborate on the other features that have been already touched upon; but I would ask you to keep in mind this fact, that had the employers in the building trades in the city of Montreal seen fit to meet with us and talk over the situation, there would not have been thousands of men walking the streets of Montreal to-day, at their loss, and also hundreds of employers at their loss, as no one can deny. If we had a law which compelled both parties to confer together, that strike would not be in existence to-day.

Mr. E. G. HENDERSON (Windsor): I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the debate on these three questions. I was much interested in the remarks of the gentleman who introduced this discussion and I listened to his reasons; but, unfortunately I am not yet convinced. I have perhaps as high a regard for the gentleman who introduced this question as I have for any one, having had the great pleasure of meeting him month after month for several years.

The first item is: "employees' right to organize." No man denies the employees the right to organize, any more than he would deny the right of any person to join the Knights of Columbus, the Masonic Lodge, or any other body. But we do not think it is fair or reasonable that one man should say to another, "You must join this order before you can work." All of us here, I am sure, believe in the old Book, and we are told there that "man shall earn his bread by the sweat of his brow."

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. E. G. HENDERSON: There is nothing said about his belonging to this body or that body; he is to be free to earn his bread as best he can. Some gentlemen evidently agree with what I said about a man earning his bread by the sweat of his brow; but I would point out that sometimes a man who is not using his hands may sweat just as much, or a great deal more than, the man who is using them. There is no mistake about that.

I say I do not think there is a man on this side of the House who would object to a person joining an organization, but we do object to his saying. "This man cannot work unless he belongs to our organization". Now, I am not going to say anything to attack unions, because I believe in them in some cases. But have the methods used by some of those organizations from time to time been so gently persuasive that we can agree with them? Have there not been occasions on which unions, or members belonging to unions, have done and said things which certainly were not in the interest of the community at large? We have had strikes sometimes causing immense losses. We have had strikes which have caused inconvenience to the whole community for the sake of a few men. Take an instance which occurred in the city of Toronto a short time ago, if you please. Eight men, I think, without warning, without reason, tied up the whole transportation system of that great city at a time when there were thousands upon thousands of people who had to get home. I do not blame the union for that, but it certainly ought to take steps to prevent that sort of thing being done. Then the

request for the recognition of the union, in a way, might come with greater force.

Another thing in connection with unions. I may be wrong: I am only asking a question. Have the great unions attempted to promote production? Or have they not attempted to decrease production or restrict it? I would like to know. I may be all wrong. If unions are so beneficial to the whole community, I would like to know what steps they have taken to increase the efficiency of the men and to increase production?

Another thing. Unionism is all right and nobody objects to it if it is rightly conducted. Are the men who form these unions differently constituted from the men who employ? I do not know that they are. I do not know that the men who employ are any greater rogues, or any more liable to disturb the harmony of the community or do anything which is going to injure the community than the gentlemen who represent labour.

Now, I would refer you to Bill 167, which was passed by Parliament at last session. I will read clause 2:

> The expression "combine" is used in this Act with intended relation to articles of commerce....

Then, coming down to paragraph c, referring to the employer of labour or the manufacturer, it says:

> Any actual or tacit contract, agreement, arrangement or combination which has or is designed to have the effect of (1) limiting facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing; or (2) preventing, limiting or lessening manufacture or production.

There are very heavy penalties. I turn over the page to subsection 2:

> The expression "combine" does not include combinations of workmen or employees for their own reasonable protection as such workmen or employees.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, we all know that the whole business of this country depends upon transportation, and cannot be carried on without it. Yet the members of the Locomotive Brotherhood or some other organizations can combine and tie up the whole transportation of the country. It is not a criminal offence; it is not an offence. But if a few manufacturers of any product get together and take certain action which may not affect the whole country they are regarded as criminals. Just think of that for a minute. Labour—and I use the word in its broadest sense—is allowed to combine to tie up the whole country, and that is not an offence at all. It may be all right; it may be that those gentlemen who labour have, as I said before, a mental attitude towards the affairs of the country which is superior to that of men that are manufacturing or who employ labour.

I listened with a great deal of attention to my friend from Scotland (Mr. A. E. Hay). I quite agree with him that labour in this country did make great sacrifices in the war, and every time I see one of those men I feel like taking off my hat to him. But there is enough credit for all. I do not think the sacrifices were confined to that body any more than to the people on this side. So we must leave sentiment out of it. He stated that some gentlemen on this side who had worked had the iron left in their heart. Are we going to infer from it that only he and some others were working for the benefit of this great Dominion? There are some on this side who think of the great Dominion in a broader sense than he or any other man on that side thinks of it. We are not all selfish. There are some who think as much of their employees as the members of the organizations think of their own. Give us some credit. Do not think we are all in business simply for the sake of making dollars and cents. It is not so. Some of us have had, we are proud to say, something to do with the building up of this Dominion, and I tell you that until we get together, until we begin to see as one, we shall never make this great country what it ought to be and what I hope in time it will be. Whether a man belongs to a union or not, give him a chance. We were told by somebody that we ought to put back the word "brother" in "brotherhood." Is there any brotherhood in saying to so-and-so: "You cannot work here with me; you must belong to the union"? Let us treat every man as a brother, and not say to any one: "Get out! you don't belong to our union." When we arrive at that stage, Mr. Chairman, we shall be able to build a nation.

Mr. C. H. GRANT (Edmonton): The third group is peculiarly composed, but it seems to me that some members of that group who are representative, should have something to say on this question. Some members here represent the Union of Municipalities and possibly represent the community at large more than most of the others. It is as a member of that group that I speak. I am not a capitalist; I am a labourer, though not an industrial labourer. I am an elected representative

of the people in the city of Edmonton, being a member of the Edmonton City Council, and I feel that this is the one question that is the most productive of trouble to the community at large. It is the community that falls between the upper and the nether millstone when the forces of labour and capital clash. To that end we are greatly interested, probably as much interested as the parties immediately concerned, on the right and left of this House, and we want to see that on this question some agreement is reached that will result in peace, and will prevent such disturbance of the peace as has occurred heretofore. But we want to see that in that agreement the interests of the community are fully protected.

Collective bargaining may be interpreted in many ways. No one disputes the right of men to join any organization. No one disputes the right of reasonable collective bargaining—the right of men to sell their labour through organization or however they may see fit. But, on the other hand, should any one dispute the right of the employer to deal with organizations which have as their object the calling out of not only those immediately interested but all the economic workers of the community? We must see that in anything that is done along this line no condition such as that can arise.

Sir Robert Borden, in an address which he delivered in the House of Commons on the 27th of May, took, I think, the correct ground when he said:

> Now, one can easily see that what is called the right of collective bargaining, if interpreted in a certain way and carried to an extreme length, might have an unfortunate effect so far as the public interest is concerned. More than that, as is suggested in this public statement, it might have the effect of placing labour men and labour unions themselves in such a situation that they could not make their own bargains except with the approval of some body that might be situated thousands of miles away. Before the phrase "collective bargaining" is insisted upon, we ought to have, and we must have, an exact definition as to precisely what is intended by it and as to precisely what the results might be if that principle, so defined, should be adopted.

We do not want any system adopted which will result in the calling out of men as was done in Winnipeg and in Edmonton. Another safeguard which I think should be provided, is that policemen, firemen, and other servants of public safety should not be allowed to affiliate with any body that has the power to order them to go out. I think they ought to be prepared to sign a statement such as that which was read by Mr. Rigg. I think that under no condition should they recognize anything except their own right and strength. They are in a peculiar manner the guardians of the public safety, and certainly should not be allowed to strike in sympathy with any other organization.

I do not intend to take up very much of your time on this matter; I simply wish to point out the interest of the community in this question, so that you may consider those who are regarded as onlookers.

I want to felicitate the speakers who have discussed this and other subjects on the floor of this House, and to concur in the remarks of your honourable Chairman, that one does not often see such an orderly gathering or hear such well-ordered speeches, even in the House of Commons. I feel that this Conference will do considerable good. For you to meet together, shoulder to shoulder, and find that you are in unity, if nothing else, will accomplish, I believe, a great good for the country.

I have been pleased to meet some of the men whom I have met here, especially some of the labour leaders whom I had not had the pleasure of meeting before. I think Canada owes a debt of gratitude to some of the labour leaders, and I think the gentlemen on the other side must consider that fact. They should have confidence that these men will do the very best they can for the Dominion of Canada, and for the advantage of the community as a whole. Their actions in dealing with these matters should inspire confidence, and lead you to rely upon the statements which they have made. I have had considerable dealings in a small way with labour leaders, and in connection with the sympathetic strike I must say that they dealt with us in our locality very fairly, and I think that they will tell you that we did the same by them.

Sir JOHN WILLISON (Toronto): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: For four days I have listened with the deepest interest and with very great respect to the deliberations of this Conference. I have sought permission to intervene at this moment because there are one or two things that I want to say, and because it has been my fortune to have had during a long period, a very intimate relation with labour union, and during the last year-and-a-half with employers.

May I say at the outset that it is impossible in my mind to challenge the principle or the legitimacy of collective bargaining. If I had been a printer instead of a

journalist, I should have desired to belong to the typographical union. During the thirty-six years that I was connected with newspapers, I was engaged in offices where, so far as the mechanical departments were concerned, they had closed shops under the control of the typographical union; and I want before this Conference to bear my testimony to the co-operation that the employers always received from that union, and to the spirit in which they made contracts as well as the spirit in which they observed them after they were made.

I believe, although I am not going into the details now, that there are certain practices in the printing business which to some degree retard production, and I have always believed that the leaders of the typographical union could do more than they have done to rid the printing trade of such practices as are inimical to production, and to increase the efficiency of printers, although the average of efficiency is very high. On the other hand, I think that we could wisely place a great emphasis on the value of a sympathetic atmosphere in any business enterprise as a means of increasing production. My experience of workmen and my experience of employers is that when the proper atmosphere is created many difficulties from which the industrial world suffers disappear.

That brings me to the second point that I desire to emphasize. During this last year and a half I have had a more or less intimate relation with employers, and I assure you, gentlemen on this side of this House, speaking as an individual and not for any group, I have found amongst the employers of Canada a disposition that has really often filled me with surprise and admiration, a disposition to do the best possible for the workmen consistent with the success and prosperity of industry. I have found among employers, to an extraordinary degree, a desire to maintain wages, to reinstate returned soldiers, to do all that could be done to employ labour at the best wages, and to maintain industrial stability. I give that testimony as my honest experience in my relations with employers.

I want to add one thing further, speaking from my own experience, going back now over a very long period. I am wholly unable to agree with the statement that the average employer thinks only of his profit. I know that in one enterprise with which I have been connected for many years no old man ever lost his place whether his working efficiency was imparied or not. By the policy of the management, he was carried throughout the remainder of his life. I believe, if the spirit which is expressed at this Conference could be carried, as it is being carried in a remarkable degree, into the business enterprises of Canada, that many of the difficulties we have had in the past would disappear. Nothing better, I venture to say, ever was done in the industrial interest of this country than to bring employers here face to face with employees, as the meeting is bound to result in their understanding each other's problems as they never did before, and each side will go away with a greater respect for the other than they ever had before.

Mr. J. P. ANGLIN (Montreal): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I thought that this was my time to say a few words in this Conference, not because my industry and my city were mentioned particularly, although that perhaps did cause me to rise to my feet a little more quickly than I would otherwise have done.

My own idea of this Conference is that we should stick to generalities and try and work out something for the good of the whole country. I quite agree with some of the sentiments expressed by the speaker who referred to the Montreal building trades situation; and, in reply, perhaps I can quote from a postal card which I found in a pigeon-hole in my room this morning. This lad had written to his Daddy. He said:

Dear Dad:

We are in Ottawa, the capital of Canada. I think Montreal is the slowest place on earth. I like Toronto best of all. Ottawa is a pretty city.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I feel with respect to the building trade in Montreal, that that really does apply. In Ottawa, we have in the building trades an industrial council which is working splendidly. It was organized this spring, and I may say that I had a slight hand in helping the organization. In Toronto they have an industrial council in the building trades, which is working well, but it is handicapped because some parts of the country are not organized in this way.

In speaking to the particular question of labour organizations, or labour unions, naturally, as a builder, and from my experience in the past, I favour dealing with organized labour. We are not in the same position as the average manufacturer. Our employees are moving from place to place, and therefore we can only deal with them through an organization. On the other

hand, Mr. Chairman, I recognize the force of the argument of the manufacturer when he says he prefers to deal with his own employees in his own plant. His plant is not organized into a union, as the managers of labour on the other side understand union, but his plant is organized in a great many cases, and in that sense it is operating with organized labour.

I like to look at this question in a broad way, Mr. Chairman, and if I felt that the Government, or that the managers and representatives of labour on the other side of the House, expected as a result of this Conference to bring in legislation that would fix all these matters hard and fast, I think I should leave the Conference at once. But I believe that we are here as reasonable men—on the one hand the managers of labour, and on the other the managers of industry. We are not toilers in the ordinary labouring sense, because I venture to say that the hands of the men on the other side of the House are just as soft as those of the men on this side. We are here as managers, each representing his own people; we on this side representing the employers, and you on that side representing the employees.

There is no question in my mind, Mr. Chairman, but that labour has gained a great victory as a result of the war; and I wish at this point to congratulate you, Sir. I believe this Conference is really the result of the thought and effort and work of the Minister of Labour, and I believe that it is his crowning glory. This Conference has been brought about by organized labour. Up to the time of the war the managers or representatives of capital did sit on the right hand; to-day they find themselves on the left.

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. ANGLIN: I believe, Sir, that this is very significant; I do not, however, believe that it means any radical change in the procedure of the business of this country. I look upon it very much as I should look upon a change in the party forming the Government at the present time. We have a good Government at the present time; they are endeavouring to work out the policy of this country to the very best of their ability; and in that sense they are good. This Conference in itself is an indication of that, and we have had many other indications in the past few years of anxiety on the part of the Government to carry out the wishes of the people and put them into force. Should we have a change, as we may have in the next few months, would there be any radical change in the procedure in this country? I say no, whether it be a Liberal or a Conservative Government. The main basic principles of government have to go on in the same way, or we would meet disaster; and I believe the same thing applies to the situation now in hand.

To get down to the specific question of labour, I feel that the employers have been very much mis-represented in the past. We have specific cases pointed out here and there where an employer has been unscrupulous and unfair; but I do not believe you can point to very many really large employers who are either unfair or unscrupulous. You remember the reference of Mr. McGregor to the sheep and the goats. Why was it the goats were on the left? Because they did not give the cup of cold water, because they did not feed the needy. I do not wish to draw an analogy, Mr. Chairman, but simply to point out that I believe that the employers as a class have lost caste because of a few employers who are unscrupulous, and I believe it is up to us as employers to show that we are ready to meet labour on a fair and square basis, and that this Conference will result in showing that to the country.

There are other sides to this question of organized labour than the one taken by the managers of labour who sit on the other side of the House. We have heard it repeated time and again in this Conference that organized labour represents a small percentage of labour; but, Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that organized labour wishes by legislation to force organized labour on the whole country. I think that perhaps some of the employers have feared that. What we do believe in is the right to organize and the right not to organize, and we must recognize the great body of labour that is not organized, and be fair to them just as we will be fair to those who are organized.

In this respect I will just quote from the newspapers this morning what was said by our good friend Tom Moore: "Will a solution which did not grant to the worker the right to work be right?" That is a question Mr. Moore asked last night in his speech, and that speech covers practically all the questions that come before this Conference I do not think that even organized labour itself would say for a moment that they would endeavour to keep a non-union man from his work.

In my own business I practically work what is known as a closed shop; that is, all my mechanics are union men. At the same time, I must say with some regret that we have absolutely no agreements with our men, because of peculiar conditions that exist in our part of the country. But I would not wish it different in so far as the employment of union men is concerned; I prefer to use union men throughout my business. It is not a matter of force that I do so, and I think this applies to the whole building industry in Canada.

There are a great many details which must be worked out, and when it comes to the question of collective bargaining we have a great many differences of opinion, but the main principles that have been put forth in the agenda as to the right of organization, as to labour unions, as to collective bargaining, I believe to be absolutely right so long as we keep in mind the rights of the masses of the country that are not organized into unions.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not desire to shut off debate at all, but may I suggest that, if there is no objection on the part of the Conference, it would be wise for us to postpone further consideration of this question until we deal with the report of the Committee on the first item of the agenda? I understand that Committee is ready to report, and the reason for my suggestion is that there are a number of gentlemen here representing Provincial Governments, many of whom have come long distances, and their time is valuable, as is doubtless the case with all of us; but the matter referred to this Committee particularly interests those gentlemen because it has to do with legislation, and, in order that they may have opportunity to consider among themselves the recommendations which the Committee will make, and which the Conference may possibly adopt, I think we should deal with that report, if there is no objection, and get that far forward.

Mr. TOM MOORE: So far as our group are concerned, we are aware that this debate could be continued indefinitely, perhaps with good results, there is so much to be said on this particular matter. At the same time, the importance of discussing other matters is realized. The intention of the preliminary discussions was simply to give a guidance to the committees, and on our part we are anxious to receive the reports of committees just as early as it is possible. The introducer of the motion has been on his feet now four times, so that I think we could safely at this juncture refer the present matter to the Committee and clear it from the agenda rather than postpone it to be carried on during the afternoon, because during the recess undoubtedly everybody would be preparing to take it up again, and we would not be getting at other important questions. The introducer of the motion is ready to take five minutes and wind up the debate, and then we would be in a position to take up the report of the Committee on Item No. 1 before adjournment.

Mr. SHAW: I do not think the gentleman representing the employers should interrupt the Chair.

Mr. TOM MOORE: I apologize if I did. Did I interrupt the statement from the Chair?

Mr. GRIER: Yes, you did. The Chairman was making a statement.

Mr. MOORE: I am sorry if I did.

Mr. SHAW: There are a few speakers yet to take part, and if they occupy thirty minutes in all we will possibly be through by the luncheon hour.

The CHAIRMAN: For the reasons mentioned I did think it would be desirable, and I think it is only a matter of proper consideration and courtesy due to the gentlemen here who represent the provincial governments and are interested in this report, which can possibly be just as well dealt with now. Therefore the statement from the Chair was that, if there was no objection on the part of the Conference, we would endeavour to deal with that report before adjournment, and then continue the debate on the other question after we had heard the report of the Committee. Is there any objection? There being none, we will hear the report.

INDUSTRIAL LABOUR LAWS.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. JOHN E. SHAW (Woodstock, Ont.): I am very pleased to say that it is my pleasure to introduce a unanimous report. We had several conferences, and the report is signed by those representatives from the employers, three from the employees and the representatives of the third group. I move the adoption of the report which is as follows:

Resolved:

That the advantage of uniformity in the laws relating to the welfare of those engaged in industrial work in the several provinces of the Dominion of Canada be brought to the

attention of the Government of Canada and of the governments of the several provinces respectively; and, that this National Industrial Conference suggests the following as a means towards the end desired, namely:

The appointment of a board composed as follows:

(1) As respects the Dominion:
  (a) A representative of the Government.
  (b) A representative of the employers.
  (c) A representative of the employees.

(2) As respects each of the Provinces:
  (a) A representative of the Government.
  (b) A representative of the employers.
  (c) A representative of the employees.

And that the Dominion Government be requested to ask the Government of each of the provinces to select or have selected representatives in respect of the Province as above set forth.

J. R. Shaw P. Thomson A. Monro Grier	For Employers
Joseph Gorman Jas. Somerville Jas. Winning	For Employees
Fraser S. Keith John Lowe	Group Three.

Mr. JOSEPH GORMAN (Cobalt): As a member of the committee on behalf of the employees, it affords me considerable pleasure to second the motion for the adoption of this report, and to be a member of the committee making the first report on matters coming before this Conference, and to be able to bring you a unanimous report. Previous to coming to this Conference high hopes were confidently expressed as to the results that would be obtained here, and common ground that would be reached by the two parties to industry in this country, and this seemed to be the unanimous opinion of public men, of labour men, and of everybody in general. I must confess that up to the present time we have not had a great deal of a material nature to justify those predictions—and perhaps I will have more to say on that question later on; but I am glad that at least we have been able to reach a unanimous decision on this question and to present it to the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion for the adoption of the report of the committee, as moved by Mr. Shaw and seconded by Mr. Gorman. Are you ready for the question?

The motion was put and carried unanimously.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have great pleasure in announcing that not only are the committee unanimous, but also the delegates to the Conference. We shall now proceed with the discussion where we left off.

ORGANIZATION OF LABOUR.

DISCUSSION CONTINUED.

Mr. ARTHUR ROBERTS (Bridgewater, N.S.): I should have been satisfied with the discussion hat it closed; but my reason for imposing on the Conference is that in the discussion on this question very little reference has been made to that large constituency known as the community. My colleague, Mr. Grant, referred briefly to it, and I felt that I would be remiss in my duty if I failed, in my representative capacity, to endorse, even very briefly, the sentiments that he expressed.

The first subdivision of the subject which is before us, "Employees' right to organize," is, of all the subjects on the agenda, probably the one that more directly affects the community, and has been the cause of the greatest concern to those whom the Hon. Mr. King termed the fourth party to industry, the community, which we were told by him is deserving in these days of much greater consideration than it ever has had in the past.

If there are any here who are permitted the privilege and the right of speaking particularly for the community, I think it will be conceded that they are the delegates who have been appointed by the Union of Canadian Municipalities, an organization representative of the municipal government of Canada, and one that stands for the cause of good citizenship, irrespective of class, race, or creed. Speaking for such a constituency, therefore, I think I am justified in emphasizing the sentiments that as municipal delegates we wish to place on the record at this time. Our message, as representing the community, is to appeal to this Conference, to our friends on the right and our friends on the left, to remember more than they have ever done in the past, this fourth party to industry. The right of labour to organize, and of all classes to organize, will be frankly admitted, provided the union is formed for legitimate purposes, and in its results and practical application does not trespass on or interfere with the rights and liberties of others. But events in Canada during the present year have made the public very apprehensive in this respect.

It is also very true to say that the profound sympathy and support of the public —the man on the street, the average citizen, —has always been with labour and its aspirations, and with all classes in their claim for equality—equality of rights, liberties,

privileges, and opportunities; opportunity for proper conditions under which to labour; opportunity for education, opportunity for obtaining and enjoying real values in life; and, above all else, opportunity for the proper development of character. Any man in this country in this year of grace who would contend to the contrary is a survival of the dark ages, and is more fitted for the care of some institution for the protection of the feeble-minded, especially after the experience we have had in the last four years. The right to organize, when claimed and acted upon constitutionally and with a due regard to the rights of the community, is a matter beyond controversy, and in that same community, in connection with this same matter, labour will always find its best friend in that higher class of citizen who originates and controls that great force known as the moral force, without which no victory can be permanent or of the least benefit to any group in the community. Part of our message to our friends of organized labour is to remember that any victory they may get without recognizing that principle will be empty; that they must have the moral force behind any victory to make it of any permanent value, or to serve even their own business interests, to say nothing as to the best interests of Canada. If that limitation is not borne in mind by those who are responsible for the activities of labour, then the public will be forced very reluctantly to defend itself, as it has done on various occasions in the past, even in Canada. I make this reference not only in regard to organized labour, but in regard to our friends the employers, or capitalists, however you wish to term them.

I have advisedly termed our friends on the right organized labour, because I am sure they do not represent, in these contests, or even in this Conference, all classes of workers. I venture to say the representatives of the municipal interests can claim for their constituents in the past a very much larger body of workers than do even the ranks of organized labour here. I refer to the large body of unorganized workers who are part of the general public, that public which always has to suffer from industrial disturbances. It may be of interest to you to know, for instance, that I come from a county with from 40,000 to 50,000 people in which we have no labour union except such as are incidental to the railways that pass through the county, and, on the other hand, we have no millionaires. The people are all working in one way or another, and they are blessed with a fair share of prosperity—and I cannot agree with the gentleman who so emphatically claimed the privilege of coming from Scotland that it is an awful state of affairs. It is a condition that with one or two exceptions applies to the province of Nova Scotia generally. So far we have found our circumstances very happy and comparatively prosperous, and I think we would be very much disinclined to exchange for the conditions in some other part of the country where labour troubles have been more in evidence during the past few years.

Now I desire, in closing, to make just a few remarks in reference to the municipal unions, and how they have been used, and can be used in the future, if necessary, in defence of the rights of the community, to which I have been referring. Some twenty-five years or so ago public opinion in the United States was outraged by the exposure of civic graft in many of their cities, and in succeeding years, in Canada, our city, town and county councils awoke to the fact that, while they were not on guard and while their parliamentary representatives unfortunately were asleep, many of their important rights had been seriously invaded and privileges purloined by what we call charter sharks and others. That unfortunate condition of affairs in the United States as well as in Canada gave rise to these municipal unions, followed by Civil Improvement Leagues, Good Citizen Clubs, and kindred organizations, which have done very much to ameliorate the results of the evil conditions to which I have referred, and have provided to some extent at least, a protection against any similar depredations.

But these unions have done more than that, and I am proud to be able to say so. They have done more than they at first had in view. They have not only taught the public to protect itself against its own internal enemies, but they have given a great impetus to the cause of good citizenship. They have inculcated the creed of public service, which has been so prominent in this country during the past four years, and have served to attach to it that self-respect and dignity to which it is entitled.

Now, with reference to our friends on both sides of the House—and I say it without the slightest meaning of any threat in any way, and I say it to the other members of the public—organizations of this kind,

which conditions in the past have made necessary and whose usefulness has been demonstrated by their history, will be a means of protection. If conditions arise in which the interests of the community are not considered, then these organizations representing the public at large will be quite capable of finding a way to protect themselves, and, in so doing, to afford protection to the largest body in this whole country, and assist in the vital progress of the Dominion.

I have nothing more to say, Mr. Chairman. I wish only to emphasize the fact that there is a fourth party concerned in industry, and that important party, the community, has only recently received notice or comment in our press, but it will be a factor in the future more than in the past if it is necessary. God forbid that it should be. This is the gist of our message, not only to the ranks of organized labour and our friends the employers, but to all classes in Canada. We must bear in mind, we must not and cannot forget, the social obligations. Any class or group of classes that attempt to grasp the throats of society and squeeze it in the spirit of the highwayman, outlaws itself. There is no place for it in such a country as Canada.

What I have said, Mr. Chairman, has been said in the hope of promoting harmony and for the purpose of asking our friends on both sides of the House to bear these considerations in mind more in the future than they have done in the past, and in the hope, in which I am sure you all join, that there will be in Canada only one class constituting good citizenship to which we shall in the future bear true allegiance.

MANUFACTURING PROFITS.

CORRECTION OF ALLEGED MIS-STATEMENT BY A DELEGATE AND IN THE PRESS.

Mr. G. M. MURRAY (Toronto): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, there are only three minutes left between now and the regular time for adjournment. I would like, with your kind permission, to move the adjournment for the purpose of enabling me to place upon the records of this Conference a correction of certain mis-statements which were made upon the floor of the House yesterday afternoon, which mis-statements have been calculated to do a great deal of harm and possibly to inflame the minds of the public against those who are represented on this side of the House, because of the belief which they engender that those who sit on this side of the House have been indulging in profiteering. The statements which I wish to have corrected appear on page 81 of the Hansard report of yesterday discussion; they contain the figures which relate to the census of production. Those figures have been widely used by the press. As a matter of fact, in yesterday evening's Ottawa Journal they are reproduced on the front page in heavy black-face type, and it is in view of the prominence which has been given to those mis-statements that I think the House is entitled to listen to an explanation and to have the correction read into the records of this Conference and should give me the opportunity of asking the press to give to the correction the same publicity that they have given to the mis-statements.

The speaker who used the figures dealt with the census of production for the year 1917. From now on I will speak simply in millions, omitting the other figures because I wish to be brief and at the same time to make myself clear. The purport of his remarks was to the effect that the total value of manufactured products was $3,815,506,869; the cost of raw material was $802,133,862: certain salaries and wages were paid, and to that were added overhead and interest on capital; leaving a balance of $1,840,137,533 unaccounted for. I absolve the speaker on the question of any responsibility for the query which is put into his mouth by the press, because I find upon reference to the record that he did not make it. But I think the purpose of giving these figures to the House was that each one of us might ask in his own mind the very question which apparently some member on this side of the House asked, which was: "who got the extra $2,000,000,000?"

Now, Mr. Chairman, the following is the explanation. Instead of the total value of manufactured products for the year 1917 being $3,815,000,000, the total value of such products, as shown by the Official Bulletin of the Census branch, which I have in my hand, and which I will leave with the Secretary of this Committee upon the conclusion of my remarks, was $3,015,000,000, the difference being the very inconsequential one of $800,000,000. The value of raw material used, instead of being $802,000,000, was, according to this same Official Bulletin, $1,602,000,000—again a very inconsequential difference of $800,000,000. Now, then, Mr. Chairman, when the value of the manufactured products has been overstated by $800,000,000, and when the value of the raw

material has been understated by another $800,000,000, we see immediately a discrepancy of $1,600,000,000. All that we are asked to explain is who got the extra $1,800,000,000? I can assure the gentlemen opposite that nobody on this side got it. All that can be proven even by the wildest manipulation of the figures is that the profits of manufacturing for the year 1917 were represented by the difference between the $1,800,000,000 and the $1,600,000,000, or were, roughly speaking, $200,000,000; and if, as shown by these official figures, the capital invested was $2,772,000,000. I think that even the most carping critic on the other side will say that capital did not enjoy an undue return upon the investment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am quite convinced in my own mind that the gentleman using those figures simply made an inadvertence. I know the explanation of one of the mistakes he made, and that is, that in quoting the cost of raw materials he inadvertently used the figures for 1915 instead of the figures for 1917, whereas all the other figures related to 1917. I assume that possibly a mistake in copying may have led to the other error of overstating the value of our products. But I want to ask him this, in all fairness, and particularly because I think it is wise that nothing should go out from the floor of this Conference that will inflame the minds of the public of Canada against either one side or the other; I will ask him to check up the accuracy of my statements here at this time, and if he finds that I am correct in what I have said, he will himself admit the inaccuracy of his statements. Not only do I believe that the mistake has been due to inadvertence, but I also believe that he is honourable enough not to wish to profit by an argument based upon a wrong statement of fact.

And, having done that, I will also ask the press, who are represented here to-day, if they in fairness to all concerned will give to the correction a prominence equal to that which they have given to the mis-statements.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Best had the floor.

Mr. W. L. BEST: Mr. Chairman, it is about time for adjournment, and I do not think I had better enter upon any of the observations that I desire to make in reply to some of the other addresses.

The CHAIRMAN: Would it be possible to dispose of the matter without further debate.

Mr. W. L. BEST: I prefer not, because there were some statements made that I think should be answered, for the same reasons as the remarks which we have just heard have been made—in the interest of harmony and in order that impressions may not go out from the Conference that are entirely erroneous. I would move the adjournment.

The Conference adjourned at 12.35

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Conference resumed at 2.30 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM CHURCH SYNOD

RESOLUTION PASSED BY CHURCH OF ENGLAND SYNOD OF ONTARIO.

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, before proceeding with the business of the Conference, may I read a communication that has been sent to the Conference through the Chair? It is as follows:

To the President of the National Industrial Conference, Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir:

Will you please, on the first opportunity, read the following resolution passed by the Provincial Synod of the Church of England in Canada in the province of Ontario, before the National Industrial Conference:

"The Synod of the Ecclesiastical Province of Ontario, deeply impressed with the gravity of the present time and the perils arising from the clash of industrial interests which clearly ordered progress and threatens the peace and happiness of our people, and realizing that the only way to attain a just and brotherly solution of the questions at issue is by means of frank discussion by experienced men in conference, welcomes the assembly of the National Industrial Conference in Ottawa, and looks forward with great hope to the successful issue of its deliberations."

George Algoma,
President.

S. Norman Tucker,
Prolocutor of Lower House.

ORGANIZATION OF LABOUR

DISCUSSION CONTINUED—THE QUESTION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Best, I think, moved the adjournment of the debate this morning. He therefore has the floor.

Mr. W. L. BEST (Ottawa): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, in rising to move that this entire matter be referred to the committee for final action, may I be permitted to make a few remarks in reply to some of the observations that have been made since the question was opened yesterday?

I am delighted to know that so many have come out with an unqualified pro-

nouncement on the question of the right of workmen to organize. Notwithstanding that every one agrees to that—I think more than half a dozen gentlemen made that statement yesterday and to-day—what I am desirous of impressing on the Conference, in closing this matter, is that every one is not prepared to do that, and that, while we are sitting in this Conference, employers of labour are refusing to recognize that right of the employees. I believe this is serious, Mr. Chairman, decidedly serious, in view of the calling of this Conference and of the manifest desire on both sides to meet here and give serious consideration to ways and means for eliminating, so far as is possible and practicable, the unrest that obtains throughout the Dominion of Canada. I refere to this because during the forenoon one or two gentlemen, and I believe in all sincerity, made the remark that every one acknowledges this right. A telegram was handed to me by a representative man from a co-worker, advising him that a certain corporation had refused to recognize the right of the workers in that respect. I am not going to mention any company; I prefer not to do that, if you do not ask me to. The telegram reads: "Had sessions with management, who refused to recognize—" and so on. I will not even mention the employees. Another memorandum has just been handed to me with regard to a public utility operated by a private corporation, which concerns, I think, almost every citizen of Canada who is a householder. They also have refused to recognize the union; and only very recently, when the attempt was made to organize in that industry, they called in many of the workers, a large number of whom I understand are females, requesting them to sign an article of agreement stating that they would not join any organization except one named by the company itself.

I believe every gentleman in this room means business. I am going to accept the declarations that have been made, and the manifestations of sincerity on both sides of the House alike, with equal sincerity; but if we are going to arrive anywhere, we must leave this Conference and go out and exercise the greatest influence we can on those upon whom we can exert that influence, in order to bring all concerned to the point where they will not only recognize the principles which we are discussing here, but will recognize the declarations made by the Government of Canada and the world powers on this very question.

I have not time, Mr. Chairman, to take up all the various questions which were touched upon by a number of the speakers who replied to the presentation of the subject. The one important point that I should like to touch upon, which has been emphasized, and I think rightly so—and perhaps it has grown out of recent events—is the question of the sacredness of contracts, which of course enters into the three subjects which we have been discussing collectively under Item No. 4. The sacredness of contract is involved, I say, in those three items, because if the right to organize is recognized, and if the organization is going to be effective, it follows that it should be recognized; and it further follows that, in order for it to be effective, the system of collective bargaining should also be recognized. Let me say—and I believe I voice the sentiments of every representative here of the workers—that we deplore any attempt on the part of any worker or any representative of the workers to disregard contracts. It is not within the contemplated purposes of organized labour, nor has it ever been. But I believe I shall be permitted to say before leaving the subject that the violation of contracts is not a new thing. It is a new thing to the public, but for over a quarter of a century to my knowledge organized labour has been spending not only hundreds of dollars, not only thousands of dollars, but hundreds of thousands of dollars because employers were violation contracts and the public of this country never knew anything about it. But the war seemed to open the people's eyes. Unfortunately many of the men in the Dominion of Canada whom I represent, because of a complication of two causes, were seized with the idea that they should violate their contracts, and for the time being they violated them. We regret it; many of them regret it more than we do. We are not condoning the action of the people who violated their contracts. I am trying to emphasize the fact that it is not a new thing, and that it was not introduced first by the workers of this country. Let me add also that I think you will find, as in the past, that the workers of this country will pledge themselves now and hereafter to abide by the contracts that they have signed, and when they desire to abandon those contracts they will give the proper notice for so doing.

Another reference was made to organized labour—as to the difficulties in dealing with it, and also as to the question of qualifica-

tions for membership in trades unions. I am not going to labour that point at all. The men who enter the ranks of the trades union movement are human beings, and I will make this statement, which I do not believe will be contradicted. That the standard for membership in the trades union movement—I speak of it in general, and not of one particular unit—is equally high with that for membership in the community in which we live or for citizenship in Canada. I want every one to think about that. We have a responsibility for our citizenship, and the members who come into their various organizations, whether religious, fraternal, industrial, commercial, or whatever else, come from the citizens of the country in which that organization grows up.

I do not think it necessary to say anything with regard to the observations made by Mr. Shaw in his criticism of the report of the Royal Commission. I have no doubt he found some flaws in it. It is not unnatural that perhaps others, like himself, have found that it did not entirely harmonize with their views. I want to say, however, that many things have been done in the past four or five years that have not harmonized with all our views. There have been very many radical changes made, and even more radical changes are going to be necessary in industry in Canada, and in the systems under which industry is carried on and developed, before real harmony can prevail. I believe that the members of the Royal Commission were looking to that when they made their recommendations. I believe they have given this matter more study, perhaps, than any representative here, or at least equal study. It is for that reason that we should give to the members of that Commission who signed the majority report the credit of having given their best time and energy and intellect towards submitting something whereby ways and means might be devised, by legislative action or industrial regulations, to readjust our entire industrial system in Canada, and if possible make for national harmony throughout this Dominion, even though we cannot adopt everything that was suggested or recommended in their report.

One of the speakers this morning referred to the fourth party to industry as not perhaps being considered, that was, the community. I think that is exceedingly important; but I believe that the community, whether represented by the local municipal organization, or by the Provincial or the Federal Government, will feel that, if workmen are employed in the service of the community, either in the municipality or in the province or by the Federal Government, they should be accorded equal privileges with the workers in any other industry. I think it is only fair to say this, because there are representatives of the Civil Service here, and perhaps other representatives of community service who may not have had the opportunity of speaking on this matter. In this connection I would like to quote a declaration made by the Prime Minister of Canada in speaking in the House of Commons on the industrial conditions in this country, which will show that the First Minister was prepared to accord to the civil servants at least some redress for the conditions under which they worked, and if necessary allow an appeal from their own ministers. He said:

> As the Government of the country has and can have no private interest to serve, inasmuch as it represents the people as a whole and acts under the authority of a mandate from Parliament, by whom its acts can be corrected at any time if they seem to be improper and unjust, one would naturally suppose that in these circumstances the Government may be trusted to act fairly in respect to the remuneration of public servants, and in respect to conditions of their employment. But I should be prepared to go further than that and say that in appropriate cases the public servants of the country, persons usually known as members of the Civil Service, might ask for and obtain a sort of appeal against the Government of the country by arbitration or some such method, but always subject to final appeal to Parliament, which is the ultimate authority so far as the Government is concerned.

My reason for quoting that is to show the disposition of the Federal Government not only to consider the personal interests that may be at stake, and avoid arbitrary and final action, but, if necessary, in order to do full justice and administer equity in the case to allow the matter to be referred further along.

In conclusion, I wish to say that if the splendid spirit of harmony and willingness to co-operate that has been manifested here is carried away from this Conference by both representatives of employees and employers, I believe you will find that the representatives of the employers all over the Dominion of Canada, who have been going to you as employers from time to time, and who feel that you should now come to them at least a few steps, will take the outstretched hand in the spirit of reciprocal fraternity, and will be willing to go hand in hand with you for the higher development, industrially and nationally,

of the Dominion of Canada in the interest of all the people. At the same time, forgetting all that may have passed, they will be prepared to look forward with you in hopeful anticipation to that era when one law shall bind all nations and kindreds and tongues of the earth.

I take much pleasure in moving that this matter be referred to the Committee.

Mr. F. P. JONES (Montreal): I take it that the motion does not close the debate, and I would like to say a few words and also ask some questions. I have no notes. I came here with an open mind, and I think that the spirit of get-together shown on both sides has been a great step. But I do not think that perhaps by a little plainer speaking we might get closer together, and, if so, I think it is advisable to have it.

The Hon. Mackenzie King spoke about four classes in industry. I think I could claim to qualify in any one of those classes, but in my present occupation I presume I would be generally put in the managing class, as I am manager for a corporation. Reference has been made to managers who considered only their own or their company's interests. There may be such managers, just as there are workmen who are not competent workmen; but we all know that there are lots of good workmen, and I think most of the gentlemen I have met agree that no manager can be successful, either personally or for his company, unless he recognizes the rights of the public, the rights of the workers in that industry, and the rights of the stockholders; all three have to receive serious consideration.

Now, the difference between us is not very great, if I understand this matter clearly. With respect to freedom, we all want freedom, we are proud of the freedom in this land, and I do not think any of us want any legislation that is going to deprive any of our fellow-citizens of that freedom, because, whether we are manufacturers or union men, the highest order we belong to is that of being Canadians. Now, the right of organization is not disputed. I think the speakers on our side have made that perfectly clear, as also the recognition of the union.

But perhaps I do not clearly understand what the people who represent labour here mean by recognition of the union. To call a spade a spade, do they mean that to be the closed shop? If so, I contend it is a great infringement on the freedom of the people of this country. As far as the employees in any concern go, I think, with all the speakers, that they have a perfect right to organize; but when any set of employees come and say to any industry in this country that none but they shall be employed, and so deprive of employment the man who does not happen to see eye to eye with them in that proposition, I say you are interfering with the freedom of the Canadian people, and I do not believe that any legislation ever will or ever could stand long on the statute-books that took away the personal freedom of our Canadian people.

Our friends have spoken about the Germans endeavouring to enforce their ideas on us, and we all know how they were stopped, and stopped largely by the assistance of so-called labour and other men—and we are proud of Canada's action over there; but while we stopped the Germans from enforcing us, we must not enforce against other people anything that would take away their rights or their freedom. Let us be absolutely honest as to what recognition of union means. If it means that an industry of this country can employ only people who belong to some society or some union, then I am opposed to it. I say that it is none of my business as a manufacturer whether a man is a Grit or a Tory, Catholic or Protestant: he has a right to work. It is none of my business whether he is a union man or a non-union man; he has a right to work. I think if we defined that, most of the difficulties would disappear.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the next speaker begins it might be wise to have an answer to Mr. Jones' question.

Mr. TOM MOORE: The question, as I understand it, was: does recognition of the union mean the closed shop? Is that your question?

Mr. JONES: Yes.

Mr. TOM MOORE: The answer is that it does not mean the closed shop unless it is part of the agreement entered into. Is that clear?

Mr. JONES: That is all right.

Mr. J. S. McKINNON (Toronto): Mr. Chairman and fellow-workers on each side of this House, I would crave your indulgence for a few minutes in order to bring to your attention a matter that has not yet been discussed. Coming from the province of Ontario, I would like first to say that it is indeed a satisfaction to us that

no man has been more prompt and careful in attendance upon this great Conference than the honoured Premier of the banner province of the Dominion of Canada.

I was impressed, Mr. Chairman, with the address of the first lieutenant of the leader of the other side of the House. I was more than impressed; I was tremendously impressed; but when he reached the conclusion of his speech, if the statement that he read in regard to the civic employees of the city of Winnipeg was the safe, sane and honest judgment of the citizens of that big city, I contend that there is much food for thought in that document; and, instead of it being an argument upon his side of the House, I think it weakened to a very great extent his logic and the conclusions at which he aimed.

There is one matter in regard to the question that is before us which was touched upon by one gentleman this morning, to which I wish to refer. He showed a direct sympathy with international unionism. You will understand that these so-called unions exist, with the head of each organization in the city of New York or the city of Chicago, for example, or some other industrial centre of the United States. The headquarters of those institutions are not in Canada. If we were to follow logically to their conclusion the arguments adduced by the gentleman this morning, you will readily understand that we upon this side of the House would have to become organized on the same line. Therefore there would be transferred from the Dominion of Canada to the United States the headquarters, not only of such unions as have been mentioned, but also those of other industries of this country. What would logically follow, Mr. Chairman, is this, that we might witness the spectacle of the honourable the Minister of Labour, the honourable the Minister of Finance, the honourable the Secretary of State, or some other ministers of the Federal Government proceeding, not to Washington, but to the city of New York, or the city of Chicago, in order to settle some internal affair concerning only the Dominion of Canada.

Some DELEGATES: Oh, oh.

Mr. FRED BUSH (Toronto): Do you mean the O.B.U.?

Mr. McKINNON: It is possible that in some cases, Mr. Chairman, this internationalism has worked out well for the Dominion of Canada; but I would point out in all honesty and sincerity that we are probably laying for the future snares of which we are not at the present time aware.

Along this line I would like also to point out that we on both sides of the House are here as labourers; but there has been interjected into this meeting a Third Party, upon whom a very great responsibility lies. That is, not the employees, not the employers, but the leaders of the different unions to which we have referred; and, Sir, I do not think that upon this occasion, before the bar of public opinion of the Dominion of Canada, it is the employees or the employers, but it is the leaders of these unions who are on trial.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Not guilty.

Mr. McKINNON: I see the Premier of the province of Ontario here, and at this point I might just remark that the bar to which I have just referred is, I believe, about the only bar that is left in the whole province of Ontario, or, perhaps, in the Dominion of Canada.

I would like, Sir, to dwell for a few minutes upon another aspect of this matter, in order to know just exactly in what position this assembly stands. I have in my hands the "Report on Labour Organization in Canada" for the calendar year 1918. I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if on the floor of the other side of the House there is a representative of the Amalgamated Mine Workers of Nova Scotia?

Mr. TOM MOORE: Yes.

Mr. McKINNON: And also if the Amalgamated Postal Workers are represented?

Mr. FRANK GRIESDALE: Western Canada? No.

Mr. TOM MOORE: The Federated Letter Carriers of the Dominion of Canada are.

Mr. McKINNON: There is in Canada, Mr. Chairman, an association called the Amalgamated Postal Workers. There is also the Brotherhood of Dominion Express Employees. I am approaching this point, not in any contentious manner, I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, but simply to know who are represented on the floor of this House. There is also the Canadian Association of Stationary Engineers. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, if they are represented.

An EMPLOYEES' DELEGATE: They are not a union.

Mr. McKINNON: If you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, I will just read from page 80 of this report:

The following is a list of the non-international central bodies which have been formed in Canada, with the names and adresses of the president and secretary of each organization.

An EMPLOYEES' DELEGATE: Is the O B U. down?

The CHAIRMAN: While the Chair does not desire to interfere in the debate, I think it is important that the remarks of each speaker should be confined to the subject under discussion rather than discuss the representation at this meeting.

Some EMPLOYEES' DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKINNON: Well, it did seem, Mr. Chairman, at this point of the debate that it would not be out of place to find out just the composition of this meeting, not, as I say, in any contentious manner, but simply for the information of this gathering as well as for the whole Dominion.

The CHAIRMAN: At any time when it might seem appropriate to ask a question on that subject I am sure all the information desired would be forthcoming; but I do question the advisability of discussing the question of representation under the heading in the agenda with which we are now dealing.

Mr. McKINNON: I may have an opportunity later on, Mr. Chairman? Thank you.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that all of us, whether upon this side of the house or the other, are anxious for the development of the industries of this country; we are all, whether employers or employees, jealous of our industries; and I hope, Sir, that after this Convention is over and we go away the same happy good feeling will continue for a long time to come, and that we shall be interested not only in the internal business of this country but also in the export; that ships will go from this country to every other country in the world carying the commerce of Canada, and that those ships will be, like the shuttle in the loom, weaving the web of concord amongst the nations.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I am rising, not to continue the debate, because my colleague has moved the reference to committee. I rise simply at this juncture to second the motion so that we may get the matter referred to committee, appreciating the fact that the tangible results of this Conference will not be so much in the debate as in the decisions and in the votes cast on the resolutions to be afterwards submitted. If we talk all day before submitting the matter to committe for resolution, we shall have had, when we go away on Saturday night, only a talk-fest.

May I be permitted to say, Mr. Chairman, that I could almost have imagined myself sitting in the House of Commons listening to a speech on the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. The liberties that were taken with the subject would give that impression. I would ask that, if we are to accomplish anything, we should at all events attempt to keep to the question, and we on this side will try to do so.

I second the motion that this question be now referred to committee for resolution and report.

Mr. J. R. SHAW: If Mr. Moore had not been so quick on his feet, I would have seconded the motion.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Mr. Shaw, with all due deference, we allowed two members from your side to speak, and we did not know that you had any anticipation of that when two had spoken in the debate.

Mr. SHAW: It is not a question of allowance. No man can shut off debate by the method of getting up and moving that the question be referred to committee.

The CHAIRMAN: The question before the house is on the motion of Mr. Best, seconded by Mr. Shaw and Mr. Moore, that item 4 on the revised agenda be now referred to the appropriate committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: May I be permitted to make just one observation at this time with reference to the discussion that has just ended, and which has been very interesting, I am sure, to all, and doubtless instructive to many who may not have given as much thought as others to this particular item.

In the closing remarks made by the mover, he referred to the fact that, notwithstanding the utterances of gentlemen representing the employers, there were instances where the right of men to organize was not yet accorded. That is very true. From day to day instances of that fact come before the Department of Labour—instances in which individuals complain that they have been dismissed from the service of their employers because they had recently joined a labour union which had not previously existed in their factory. But I think there are two sides to that question. We must accept as the general opinior

held by employers the expression on the part of the employers here, that so far as they are concerned, and so far as they represent the various industries, it is their opinion that there ought not to be any objection or opposition to men belonging to a labour union. Likewise, the employers might say that, notwithstanding that representatives of labour at this Conference have gone on record as stating emphatically that they desire and propose to observe contracts, yet there are instances where workmen have not at all times observed their obligations. But I think the employers should, and will on this occasion, accept in good faith the assertion made by the representatives of labour that it is their intention henceforth to adhere more closely, if possible, to any obligations which they may have undertaken. That being true, I have high hope of the influence upon those outside this convention hall who have not heretofore been observing their obligations, either on the one hand or on the other, and that for the future the result of this Conference will be very beneficial and far-reaching in its effect upon the minds of the people, both employers and employed, throughout this Dominion.

Before proceeding with the next item on the agenda, I would again ask the honourable gentleman who has favoured us with his presence during the week, but who appears to be bashful and does not always take his place at the front of the hall, to come forward. I refer to Hon. Mackenzie King. I would rather see him here than at the back of the hall.

Mr. King accepted the invitation.

JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS.

DISCUSSION—THE QUESTION REFERRED TO COMMITTEE.

The CHAIRMAN: The next item of business before the Conference is the consideration of item No. 5 of the revised agenda, which is as follows:

> Consideration of:
>
> (a) the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations in favour of the establishment of a bureau to promote the establishment and development of Joint Industrial Councils;
>
> (b) the further recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations regarding the establishment of Joint Plant and Industrial Councils.

I assume that the representatives on each side who are to deal with this subject are ready to proceed.

Sir WILLIAM HEARST (Premier of Ontario): I desire to make a statement, Mr. Chairman, before we enter upon this item of the programme. I rise simply to tell the Congress that the representatives of the provinces intend to meet at 4 o'clock to discuss questions which have been before the meeting and to decide on the method of acting that we think proper on behalf of the provinces. So the Congress will understand that when we withdraw at 4 o'clock it is not out of any lack of interest in the proceedings or by reason of any discourtesy to whoever may have the floor at that time.

Mr. T. A. STEVENSON: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. I want to make a correction regarding an item appearing in last evening's Journal. It says:

> Col. Cantley, who spoke for what is known in the Conference as the "Third Group," supported the manufacturers, declaring that he considered the universal application of an eight-hour day impossible.

I want to say, as a member of the Third Group, that Col. Cantley did not speak for the Third Group; he spoke as an individual. He certainly did not voice my sentiments on the eight-hour question. I belong to an organization that has worked to get the eight-hour basis for the last fourteen years, and as far as my personal views in the matter are concerned I think the eight-hour day could just as well be made universal as it has been applied in the printing trade of the North American continent. Therefore, I repeat, Col. Cantley did not express my views when he made that statement.

Dr. D. STRACHAN (Permit): In addition to my appreciation of being an humble member of this Conference, I consider it a very great honour to be asked to introduce this particular question—the establishment of Joint Industrial Councils in the industries of Canada. I can assure you that I do not intend to occupy the time of the Conference at any great length; but I may be allowed to say that I think it is very meet that I should open this subject. How to open it is rather a more difficult problem than might perhaps appear to many of you who are sitting around in ease in Zion at this particular moment. However, I believe I am for the first time in this Conference introducing a matter that is not contentious. I believe, moreover, that I am introducing a matter that touches the very heart of the occasion for which we are gathered together here to-day. We

have grown very much in the last few years. We have learned many things from the war. It seems almost out of place to refer to the war or to use it as an illustration at this particular time; but I fancy that I am within the judgment of every one when I say that the war was fought that there might be decent relations between nations, and if there is one lesson that we have learned from the war and are trying to put into effect day by day, it is, I think, that at any rate there should be decent relations between man and man in the carrying on of the industries of this country.

For that reason there has come into effect, of comparatively recent date, in the last few years, a very serious attempt to settle the difficulties that arise from time to time—difficulties that are sure to arise when human individuals are dealing with human individuals. It is a serious attempt to settle these difficulties by getting together and overcoming them as men ought to do, and that is the reason why there has come into being this very idea of Joint Industrial Councils.

I am perfectly sure that every one will agree that there are two ways of settling our difficulties. One is by fighting; and I need not enlarge upon that to say that if a fight occurs both sides lose. I think everybody on this side of the Conference or on the other will acknowledge that. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is any other way of settling a difficulty apart from the method of getting together and settling it amicably. What is the nature of the Joint Industrial Councils that have come into existence in the last few years? What is the idea underlying them? It is that we recognize one another's rights, and when differences arise we come together and say that we will meet at a common table in order that we may look into one another's faces, that we may understand one another and recognize our differences, and settle them as new light comes to us from time to time. The Royal Commission in their wisdom have suggested a certain form of joint industrial councils. I do not believe this country is ready. I do not believe the Royal Commission themselves were ready, and I do not believe the industries are ready, to have any particular form of industrial councils recommended at the present time. I say that advisedly, because of the experience I have had in connection with the company I represent.

I suppose it is fairly well known that the Imperial Oil Company put into operation a joint industrial council, or an industrial plan as it is called. This is not the Colorado plan; it is not the Rockefeller plan, if there is such a plan; it is not the Whitley plan; it is not the Leitch plan; it is simply the Imperial Oil plan. It was put into effect because of the condition that we found in our own plant. We put in a plant that we thought would fit into conditions that we have; and what are these conditions? They are not extraordinary conditions; they are conditions that we have in our various plants where there are union men and non-union men. The underlying thing that we had in our mind in putting this plan into effect was that there should be an opportunity for conference, that we should be able to get together, that we should put into effect the right kind of collective bargaining—and collective bargaining is not collective haggling, but collective bargaining. But the main thing underlying all is that we should get together and try honestly and fairly to come to a settlement of the difficulties that are sure to arise from week to week and from month to month in the management of a large concern.

We have had eight months of this plan. During that eight months we have had twenty-eight conferences; we have settled one hundred and nineteen questions, and we have settled them satisfactorily. I read to you to-day a quotation from one of the resolutions passed by the men themselves, and I just want to read to you a sentence or two that I read before the Royal Commission. I do not suppose everybody read it, because I do not suppose everybody does read what I say. But this is the conclusion that I came to, after the most serious consideration of the work to which I have devoted myself during the past year. This is what I said:

> I believe in the plan because I feel that any medium which forces men of varying opinions to sit down face to face, week after week, in an open, untrammelled exchange of views, must result in a fairly even balance of the rights of each being ultimately established. In all the negotiations conducted under our plan I cannot remember when labour has lost ground. Neither our labour nor our executives are dreamers enough, however, to believe that they have found the panacea for all the ills of the industrial world. It is difficult to devise machinery for the adjustment of the human relations, but in practical operation the Industrial Representation Plan of the Company has proved a great advance over any other attempt at the solution of modern industrial problems which has come under my observation.

That, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen, is as far as I am prepared to go to-day. This thing is in its experimental stage. I do

not believe it is possible to introduce the Whitley plan into Canada at the present time. I am rather surprised that any man who ought to know the conditions in England, as he says he does, or that any man who ought to know the conditions in Canada, as he says he does, should deliberately come before this Conference, and seriously propose the introduction of the Whitley plan in this country for the carrying on of our industries to-day—why? Because the Whitley plan means, first, before you can bring it into operation, that you have to make the conditions; you have to construct the conditions for the purpose of putting on top of them the ready-made plan. It cannot be done; it would be stupid to try that, I think. What is the other thing to do? It is to try to understand the conditions that we have to-day, and to get some plan, I do not care what it may be. There are dozens of plans in operation in this country to-day that no one has ever heard of. Since I have come to this Conference I have heard of plan after plan that east and west have been adopted, independently of us and independently of others, and they have come to the same result—an opportunity for the management and men to come together for the purpose of settling their difficulties. What is the main thing after all? It is to bring back into our companies the thing that has been lost by the enlargement of industry—the human touch. I contend, from the experience I have had—and I am perfectly certain that the gentleman who knows more about this thing than any other man in the Dominion could well say the same thing—that it is not a question of machinery. Your machinery is no good, your plans are no good, unless they have at their very heart and centre the thing that we have been losing—the human, personal touch.

You men have been working for the recognition of the union. Do you know what you ask for? Do you know what you want? It is not the recognition of the union or of some mechanical plant; it is the recognition of the individual soul, and that is what I, if I were you, would fight for. I should not fight that. I should be recognized as a brass tag, but for the recognition of personality and individuality. I should fight that I should be recognized as a man; and that is what this plan that we have put into effect does to-day.

It may be criticised, and I am sure it will; it may be found fault with by some of you men, and I am sure it will, because you do not understand it—that is the reason you will find fault with it. But I want you to recognize this one great thing, that men on one side and men on the other side will confer in a human, personal way, and try to settle their difficulties as man to man.

Do you recommend, do I recommend, the establishment of a bureau for the purpose of putting this system into effect? I have not very largely consulted the men round about me; but if I were expressing here my own view about this matter, I would say that I believe that about as far as any Government ought to go to-day in Canada would be to express their belief, and to recommend very seriously to the attention of all industries, that there should be a way open in every industry for conference and the bringing together of men and managements for the mutual benefit of the industry; but as to suggesting any plan or any mechanical device, I should say that the time for that has not arrived.

Now, the recommendation of the Royal Commission for the establishment of a bureau to promote the development of joint industrial councils causes me to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am afraid of bureaus. We have so many that we are knocking against them every day. I am afraid of a bureau in connection with this work. I do not know whether it would be infra dig. or foolish of me to give a little of my own experience. When I was asked by the Imperial Oil Company to take charge of this work and put it into effect, day by day the directors were asking me, "Well, what are you?" The one thing I wanted to emphasize, according to the light I had about it, was: this is to be no bureau; it is to be no department. "Well, but what are you?" I said. "That does not make any difference; I do not know what I am; but it is the directors who are going to be responsible for this thing. It is going to be no department, no bureau; it must be the directors who put this into effect; that is the directors must come into contact with the men." Finally the day came when I had to declare myself and to declare what position or title I was going to take. I suppose you can hardly guess the title I chose; but, being Scotch, I am ambitious and would like to control the whole thing some day, and I said: "My idea is that I be assistant to the president, with the idea that I be next in command."

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Dr. STRACHAN: This is not a joke. I am serious about this thing. I did n

want it to be regarded as some mere department and myself considered a clerk. What I wanted was that the president himself should be directly responsible and should accept responsibility for coming into personal contact with those men through me.

Now, how has this thing worked out? We have had only eight months' experience, but so far the plan has worked out all right. Whether or not it is going to work to-morrow, I cannot say. I can go this far, however, and say that if we get any fair chance and if the boys that we are dealing with are willing to play the game as fair as we want to play it, and—I say this deliberately——if they are willing to play the game as fair as the directors that I know want to play it, I have no hesitation in saying that it will be a success.

There are one or two things that I think ought to make it a success. In the first place, in the company to which I refer every man has a square deal, and that is the motto of this Industrial Representation plan. No man can be dismissed by a foreman without a fair hearing. That is another good thing. There is no discrimination for membership or non-membership in any organization, even in any church, even non-Presbyterian. Now, that is going a long way.

You ask: Do the recommendations that come up from these men receive any attention? I can tell you one incident at any rate that has happened. A foreman dismissed a man. That man appealed, and the matter came before the council, and the question was thrashed out, and the council unanimously decided that the man had got a raw deal and should not have been dismissed. He was put back on his job within five days. That is worth something.

A DELEGATE: Did he get his pay?

Dr. STRACHAN: I do not believe the man was thinking about his pay. He was thinking about something that was infinitely greater.

A DELEGATE: He was not a Scotchman.

Dr. STRACHAN: If the great Prophet of two thousand years ago had lived to-day, instead of saying, "Man shall not live by bread alone," he would have said, "Man shall not live by wages alone."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have said all that is necessary. I believe in the Industrial Representation plan. I do not believe we have arrived at a time when any Government can make out any particular plan. I am a little troubled about the erection of a bureau; but I believe the Government can do a great deal when this matter is brought to their attention, recommending employers and employees in all industries to make some arrangement by which they can get together and settle the difficulties which may arise from time to time.

Mr TOM MOORE (Ottawa): Mr. Chairman, the last speaker has just referred to two thousand years ago. The occupation credited to that Prophet will be well within the memory of all, and also what was done to him. I chance to be in the same position to-day, and I think they have about crucified me by giving me the task of replying.

It is very difficult to criticize or analyze the plans or the ideas of one who, you feel confident, is sincere in what he is preaching, and I am well satisfied that the last speaker, without shadow of doubt, believes absolutely with the deepest sincerity in all that he has said. I am well satisfied that he believes without shadow of doubt that almost the panacea for the time being has been found in the solution that has been attempted in the plant over which he has control.

As to the advisability of meeting, man to man, there can be no contention. We must agree that that item at all events is non-contentious. The process of development of industry demands that different methods shall be employed to those that have been employed in the past, to the detriment not only of industry but of all civilization itself. Therefore, when we speak of this important subject of Industrial Councils, I believe that we are speaking of something which marks an epoch in industrial social life, which means not only to us but to all the breaking down of the barriers of industrial autocracy. It is with that idea that co-operation must be entered into. It must not be with the idea of conceeding on one side or demanding on the other. It must be with the idea of the equality of the managerial ability with that of the labour that produces in the factory. Therefore, when I speak of Industrial Councils for myself and for those on this side of the House I speak of them not only for the purpose of consolidating workmen, as Mr. Shachan said, but for the purpose of reaching definite conclusions for the advancement of the democracy in industry which we all so much desire.

Having admitted almost unanimously I think, the necessity for Councils, the

question naturally arises as to what form they shall take. What is the price which must be paid for the institution of Councils of this kind? There is nothing obtained in this world unless a price is paid. The victories which we have won on the battlefields claimed their price, and the industrial democracy of to-day will claim its price from both sides. It will claim its price from the employer of the past who has said: "This is my industry; I am going to control it." That class of employer is happily fading away, but still he is far too numerous for the industrial peace of this country. It will claim its price from the employee, who must realize that with the opportunities of meeting in conference goes the responsibilité of being more than a machine in the industry in which he is employed. But if we are told that the price of the Councils must also be a sacrifice of the organization that we have built up, then I want to say candidly that there is little opportunity for these Councils being instituted at the present day.

Roughly speaking, there are three different kinds of Industrial Councils. One is most commonly known as the Rockefeller plan. Included in that naturally would be the Imperial Oil Company's plan, the International Harvester plan, and others of similar denominations. I say included in that, for the simple reason that the base of the plan is the same base, though the detail may vary according to the circumstances. The base of the Rockefeller plan is the non-recognition of trades unions. I make that statement knowing full well the responsibility of a statement of that kind. The gentleman has referred to the Imperial Oil Company's plan, as to which we find there this declaration: "The Company will maintain an open shop, without discrimination against unions or against any man on the ground of creed, race, colour," etc. There are many ways of destroying trades unions, and they have nearly all been tried except the one of agreeing to them but seeing that they do not operate and function; and this is the design of the plans which are based on the Rockefeller plan. I want to make clear what I mean by that. I believe that all the so-called Rockefeller plans contain a clause about not discriminating against trades unions. Take the International Harvester Company's plan, which contains one headed "No Discrimination," saying: "There shall be no discrimination under this plan against any employee because of race, political belief, religious belief," etc. You will find that common to them all; and what does it mean? It means that you say to your employee that he can belong to a Trades Union, if he likes, but so far as the matters which Trades Unions are formed to function upon are concerned, it is unnecessary for him to belong to the union, because you have substituted something in your plan that replaces it. It might be that the spirit in every man is so strong for Trades Unionism that he would survive under a condition of that kind; but we usually find that in the earlier days of the plan, a certain degree of suppression is made in the operation of a plan of that kind, it so appears that the average man thinks he is going to accomplish something without the co-operation of his fellow-workers outside of that particular plant. Therefore, knowing that, knowing what its ultimate operations lead to, I say deliberately that that single clause, if it were made general, would mean the destruction of trades unionism.

You may ask: "Why should you be afraid of that if it accomplishes the industrial peace which we are after?" There are many kinds of peace, Sir. I think that probably the most logical and the final conclusion of a peaceful community would be found in a grave-yard. We do not want industrial peace which is brought about by industrial subjection. The Trades Unions—and this interjects somewhat with a subject which has gone before—the trades unions resist plans of that nature. Conflict occurs sooner or later where plans of that kind have been put into operation, because we know that once the power of the Trades Union has been destroyed there is no real protection behind the men who constitute the members of Councils of that description.

Recently in the western part of our country there came into operation a movement rebellious against the International Trades Union movement. It claimed to be a purely Canadian one. The International Trades Union movement resisted that because they knew that it was wrong; they knew that it would destroy not only the power of the movement that we represent, but that it was leading men on the wrong basis—the method of force—to accomplish what they wanted. The argument holds in regard to this type of Industrial Councils. The employer does not relinquish one atom of his power to control his industry through the operation of these Councils; but little by little, as

the worker separates himself from other workers, he relinquishes his power until the time arrives when they are one more in equal balance, and the employer can benevolently continue, or he can unscrupulously deal with his men and reinstate all the autocracy that he had previously possessed.

Trades Unionism is not willing to give up that which it has purchased at a price. Trades Unionism knows only too well by experience what it wants. Trades Unionism is not an experiment of nine months; it is a human experience of centuries: Therefore when we have the machinery and the methods of co-operation established, why should we at the first offer take an experiment, something that we know nothing of, something that may ultimately come to be right, and throw aside that what has cost so much to obtain? When you ask men and woman, members of the Trades Union movement, to forget their Trades Unionism and to co-operate in Councils based on the Rockefeller plan, you are asking them something that it is impossible to give. Men and women who have spent their lives building up this movement, and who have seen its errors and attempted to correct them from year to year, who have confidence in the experience they have gained, who know that it can settle the industrial problems if given a free opportunity, given the right of Council, given the right of expression, removing all the obstacles to its fullest development—knowing that it can do that, why should we ask for new machinery that is not tested and that we know nothing of? Why should you ask those men and women to forget all about that machinery, and to try something new? In England they have realized the foolishness of a request of that particular kind. In other countries they have realized the foolishness of asking men to relinquish that which they themselves have built up. And if there is one thing in co-operation more than another, it is the feeling of confidence, the feeling of power, the feeling of responsibility that is given by operating the machinery that you yourself have built, and not that which somebody has donated to you. Therefore when we say to you that we want Industrial Councils, the Trades Union movement has stood ready at all times to establish Councils, and has desired and requested through its whole history the opportunity to meet across the table and discuss these things. By its knowledge and experience it has provided the machinery to do this.

When we ask you this, are we doing anything alien to the spirit of the age? Earlier in the day reference was made to the Industrial Councils report, where it said that the progress of industrial development must be step by step, based on the experience of the step before. We know well enough, and we think the community knows, that the Trades Union has been built up step by step. This is the logical development of the steps that have been taken, and instead of following in logical sequence and going the next step higher, you say, "Come across on to a new ladder and see how you like the rungs of this one." I say to you, gentlemen, if you are sincere and frank come out and say: "We want co-operation, and we are willing to use the machinery that has proved itself capable of giving co-operation."

The great railroads of this country have been pointed to, even by some whom we might class as opponents of Trades Unionism, as an example of the co-operation which is possible through the Trades Union movement. The railroads have practically an Industrial Council over the Dominion of Canada. You have the Railway War Adjustment Board, where the representatives of the Industrial Trades Unions meet with the managerial end of the railroads and settle their disturbances and disputes, and since the inception of that Board there has not been a strike or a dispute that has been unsettled.

The Printing Trade has been referred to. A document that I have had the opportunity of reading, which some of you may have had, shows how Trades Unions operate for the establishment of industrial harmony and conciliation in the International Typothetae. They are not afraid of the men from the United States being a part of it, on either the employers' side or the employees' side. That came about only after a deplorable conflict which was referred to earlier in these sessions, when millions of dollars were spent to demonstrate the power of Trades Unionism.

Councils are operating also in this country. In the city of Toronto there is a Building Trades Council; another one in the city of Ottawa, to which Mr. Anglin referred. Those are based, not on the non-recognition of Trades Unions, but on their recognition; and there is an important feature attached to that. Whether it is in the building trade or in any other industry

or in a factory, you cannot have any man speak for other men unless he has means of communication and conference with those men. You cannot elect a representative in any department of your plant who can represent those men unless he meets and confers with them; and if he so meets and confers, you have a measure of organization. But if it is correct to recognise a measure of organization, why not frankly recognize the fulness of organization and regular conference? Therefore when you take a representative of the Trades Union you are not taking a man who is speaking his individual opinion, but one who is transferring into those Council chambers that which he knows the other workers themselves desire. But when you come to the individual representative in this so-called plant system you are destroying that unity, that conference between the individual representative and the rest of the workers, and sooner or later conflict occurs.

Only very recently the International Harvester Company, which is headed by a man who, I believe, is desirous of being just and upright, and whose Council was formed with the fullest intention of doing right, became involved in a deplorable strike, and why? My simple belief is, because the men acting on that Council, though acting in good faith, did not know the aspirations, the hopes, and the desires of the men for whom they were attempting to speak. Therefore, on that ground alone, it is absolutely essential, if you are to have success in your Councils, that you recognize the official mouthpiece of the Trades Union workers themselves. I would like to read you a little extract in that respect from the Whitley Councils report. I know that this refers to England, but it is worth while to read it:

> Moreover, it is essential that the organization at each of these three stages should proceed on a common principle, and that the greatest measure of common action between them should be secured. It is also of the highest importance that the scheme making provision for these committees and councils should be such as to secure the support of the Trades Unions and Employers' Associations concerned. Its design should be a matter for agreement between these organizations.

What is true in that declaration is true of the Dominion of Canada.

Just here I want to correct some statements which have been made which would leave a wrong impression relative to the Trades Union movement of this country. It has been stated that we were one-eighth, one-tenth—and I do not know what other degrees of inefficiency have been mentioned as the proportion to the organizations of this country. The figures which you submitted, Sir, showed that there were reports from approximately 600,000 workers, which you stated in the first or second day's proceedings, was over fifty per cent of the industrial workers of this country. That means that we have just over a million workers in this country. The Trades Union movement records issued by the Labour Department in 1918 show that there are 248,000 organized workers, which means 28 per cent of the total number. But that is the record up to December, 1918; and let me say, as the representatives of the organized labour movement of the Dominion of Canada, that the movement we represent has increased fifty per cent in numbers during the last year alone. When you ask whether we as a minority have a right to speak for the workers, I want to ask you how many strikes have you known for refusal to accept that which the organized workers have obtained for the unorganized workers? Have you known them often take action in that respect? I venture to say, Sir, that in almost every instance the unorganized worker has said: "That is what I wanted, but I did not know how to go about it." In almost every instance they are willing to accept the decisions arrived at by the organized workers. There is a reason for that, which is very simple—that the men and women composing the Trades Union movement are of the same flesh and blood, of the same class, with the same aspirations and the same difficulties, as the others alongside of whom they are working. Therefore when they meet in conference and arrange on a common understanding, it is only logical to assume that it represents the desires of even those who are not at that conference. I have in mind, Sir, that our political records will show that the average representative in Parliament is not elected by the majority of the constituents. If you take the number of votes cast you will usually find that he has been voted for by a minority of the electors in the constituency he represents. Yet no one ever disputes the right of that man to sit for the constituency. It is just the same in the Trades Union movement, so that you need have no fear of its leading to industrial strife to obtain recognition for Councils which are got from the ranks of organized labour.

There is another plan, Sir, to which I would like briefly to refer, that is, so-called Leitch plan, a plan founded and based on

the principles of the political constitution of the United States. Under this plan the manager of the company is practically the dictator, or rather he becomes the President in order that the constitution may be similar to the political constitution; the managerial executives are the Senate, and the elected representatives from each department are the lower house, or the House of Representatives. These meet and discuss what they want, and that is passed on for review to the Senate, and if it meets with the approval of the President when it reaches him, it is put into operation. This plan, in my estimation, Sir, means only one thing; it simply means that if that individual at the top is benevolently inclined, there may be success, provided he remains so at all times; but if he is maliciously inclined, then it is autocracy in its worst form. But even if he is benevolently inclined, I doubt its success, for the simple reason that it is paternalism, and the workers of this or any other country do not desire, and entirely turn back, any offers of paternalism at this particular time.

We want equality. Therefore we desire at this time to offer our co-operation, as we have offered it throughout the history of the Trades Union movement. We desire to ask for your co-operation in the establishment of these Councils throughout the country. We desire you to open your minds and to get rid of your suspicions and doubts as to what the Trades Union will do with its power. We desire you to help along the development of all that is highest in the human being by co-operation and encouragement rather than resistance. King Canute sat and waved back the ocean, yet the tide came along. Employers for a hundred years have sat and waved back the Trades Unions, but they still roll along in ever-increasing numbers; and, gentlemen, I want to say to you that, whether you will it or not, the Trades Unions of this country will continue to exist and they will continue to be an ever-growing factor. If they are met with resistance, if they have to build themselves up in the face of opposition, do not expect that the same tolerance can be exhibited by men who have had to fight every inch of the way, as if the same things were conceded to them in a spirit of equality.

Therefore look ahead. Say that now is the time for a frank recognition. Even if the institution of these Councils does mean the complete unionization of this country, let us have them. It does not necessarily follow that if you have representatives from Trades Unions every man must be a member of a Trades Union, or that, in other words, there must be a closed shop. The railroad brotherhoods have not the closed shop in all instances. There are non-union men working, but they are satisfied to have the representatives of organized labour represent them on their National Industrial Councils. And so it is in other trades. If you believe in the right of men to organize, if you believe in the fullest freedom to organize, then remove this obstacle of the fear which is in the minds of underpaid men and women workers, who dare not join an organization in case it may mean losing their employment; who are chained to the little industry in the factory wherein they work, by economic surroundings. Remove that fear and say to them: "We recognize that the basis of future co-operation is organization. You are not organized. We are not forcing you to organize, but we give you the fullest liberty and freedom to do so, in order that you may co-operate with us. We are willing to take your representatives, when you are organized, as the basis of the representation on these Councils." Say that, gentlemen, and you will have no trouble so far as the operation of the Councils is concerned.

But I would be foolish to say, or to lead any one to believe, that the institution of Councils, of itself, would remove every difficulty from the industrial field, either in this or in any other country. There may be times when with the utmost honesty of intention, with the utmost desire for co-operation, a clash of ideas will come. We hope that the clash will not occur often. We are living in different environments, and our duties require us to look upon life with different eyes. We try our best to look upon it from the viewpoint of the other man, but we are not successful in doing so as fully as he himself can do it. Therefore you must expect that sometimes these clashes will come. But I am confident that if these Councils are established, with the full and free recognition of the Trades Union basis, and if all doubt is removed from the minds of the workers that this is only a subterfuge to prevent their further organization in the Trades Union channel, the larger percentage of our present industrial disputes will be eliminated. But I am satisfied also that there will have to go with it that feeling of lifting up—of sharing, if you like, some of the benefits of industry with those who compose the Councils.

I have spoken, Mr. Chairman, over my time, and I am sorry to have taken so long, but I feel the importance of this particular subject. I recognize that there are industries in this country that are not organized, and that there are many which are only partly organized. We have no desire to hinder men because they are unorganized from having a Council; we have no desire to say to the employers that they must organize their men into Trades Unions before a Council is established; but we do say that if the men of themselves, or the women of themselves, desire a Council it should be given to them. The employers should declare, as is done in the case of the British councils, that, realizing that full success comes from organization, they regard the establishment of a Council under unorganized conditions as only a temporary measure; and they want to encourage the employees and advise and help them towards forming an organization, so that the best results may be achieved.

In order to do this, Mr. Chairman, the second part of the recommendation is necessary. It is necessary that there should be, throughout the length and breadth of the country, some agency that can place these facts before the employers and the employees, so that their activities may be directed into the proper channels, and for that purpose the establishment of a bureau is appreciated by us and receives our approbation. We believe that the Department of Labour should create a separate bureau, with a separate official, or separate officials if you like—those who are conversant with the Trades Union movement; those who are broad enough to know the troubles and the trials of the employer; those who can gather information as to what is going on with regard to councils throughout the civilized world, and can issue that to employers and employees alike, so that they may obtain the best of advice; who can send out officers, if necessary, in order to call and convene meetings to bring the parties together, instead of waiting until they drift together through some industrial dispute. We are in agreement absolutely with the establishment of a bureau of this kind.

Let us meet this issue fairly. Let us ask the Committee to come back with a report that councils should be established and a bureau organized; that the basis of these councils should be trades union representation wherever the trades union exists, and that where it does not exist the fullest and frankest assistance towards the establishment of organized conditions should be given by the employer and the employee alike.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, it was not my intention to take any part in the discussion this afternoon, but Mr. Moore's remarks in regard to the importance of promoting union development along the right lines are so wholly in accord with my own feelings and belief that I am sure he would not like, nor would any one in this gathering like, a false impression to go abroad as to the significance of the industrial plan to which he has made a reference in the early part of his address. I rise, not to argue at all the merits of any industrial representation plan, but simply to make clear a matter of fact as to the real purport and intention of what he has spoken of as the Rockefeller Plan. I had something to do with the genesis of this plan of industrial representation, and were I to say a few words to this gathering as to the circumstances which brought it into being, and the purpose it is intended to serve in the industry to which it is applied, it would perhaps be helpful to all concerned.

I was asked four or five years ago by the Rockefeller Foundation of New York if I would make a study of industrial relations with a view of helping if possible to disclose those principles which applied to industry would make for better relations between employers and employed. I was named for that work by President Eliot, of Harvard University, who was one of the trustees of the Foundation. The trustees of the Foundation, when they asked me to undertake the study, did so, as I learned at the time, because they believed that having been in the Department of Labour of this country for a number of years as deputy minister and for some years as minister, I might perhaps be able to be of some service to industry generally in that particular study. I undertook it believing that, while I had many limitations, I was perhaps better qualified to render a service to my fellowmen in that direction than in any other.

I had scarcely started on this study when my attention became directed to one of the most serious industrial conflicts that has ever taken place on this continent, I mean the strike in the coal mines of Colorado, in which, as all persons here know, through differences between the militia and the workers, about one hundred women and children lost their lives and hundreds of families were left famished and starving. I said to myself: What is the sense of making

a theoretical study to present to the people of this continent when there is a practical condition that requires looking into? And, without being requested by any person so to do, I went out to the state of Colorado myself to use that particular state as a laboratory in which to demonstrate what could be done as a result of applying certain principles in which I firmly believed.

Before going I wrote to the Rockefeller Foundation and asked if the trustees had any objection to my taking that step. They replied that I was free to do as I wished, the responsibility was mine; I must take it and take the consequences—which I was ready to do.

I wrote also to the Secretary of Labour in the United States, Mr. Wilson, whom I also interviewed, and asked him if he thought it was a wise step. He told me he would thank God for any man who would go out there and help to bring about better conditions.

I took the same course with the late Mr. Seth Low, who had been appointed by the Government of the United States as a commissioner to inquire into conditions in Colorado. I asked if his commission had any objecton to my going and making this study. I did not wish to interfere with their line of work. Mr. Low replied in very much the same way that Mr. Wilson had done, only he went further. He said: " Mr. King, if you will go, with the experience that you have had in these industrial questions, I shall be glad to have our commission delay its going out and making its final report, for some months, so as to give a chance to the people of Colorado to work out this question in the way of a settlement satisfactory to themselves, if that is possible.

When I reached Colorado I immediately saw the governor of the state and asked him if he had any objection to my making a study of conditions with a view of offering some suggestions. He was as cordial in his invitation as the other gentlemen had been in their expression of their desires. I had my secretary, Mr. F. A. McGregor, with me, and we spent some months interviewing the different people who had been connected with those troubles, in visits to the mines and mining camps concerned, seeing those who had been the leaders of the strike, and those who had taken part in it, also members of the State Government, the state militia and the employers, and in getting as full and complete an account of the situation as was possible.

Looking over all the facts, it seemed to me that the situation came down to this: That the whole trouble might never have taken place had employers and employees and their representatives come together to confer over the matters in dispute between them. The question was one mainly of recognition of the union. The men claimed that any man in the company's employ who joined a union was dismissed; that the foremen dismissed men in a summary way and there was no right of appeal; that when a man joined the union he was immediately thrown out of the company's employ. I found much to substantiate that contention, and it seemed to me that it was an entirely wrong procedure—that no hope of industrial peace would ever come in Colorado if employers were to take an attitude of non-conference with their employees, or if they were to take the position that their employees were not to have the right to join a union, or if, when they joined a union, the foremen were to be free to dismiss arbitrarily any men in the company's employ.

When I had gathered all the information that I could get together, I came back to my residence here in Ottawa, examined that material, sifted it carefully, and drew up what seemed to me some of the outstanding principles that should be recognized if there was to be industrial peace in Colorado in the future. When I had drawn up a statement of what seemed to me was needed to improve conditions for the thousands of working people employed in the coal industries of that great State, I sent that communication to Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who was president of the Foundation at the time, and who had an interest in the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, one of the companies concerned. I had met Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., in New York, and had had a few conversations with him. I had not come to know him well, but the little that I had seen of him made me believe that there was a man in the United States, in the ranks of the employers of labour, whom the employees could count on in the future—a man who was prepared, as between capital and labour, to stand at least for justice and fair play, if no other man on the continent of North America did. That was the impression I formed of Mr. Rockefeller, Jr. So I sent my impressions and suggestions to him, and said, in effect: I think this is what is needed in Colorado. I think that to settle the troubles in Colorado, the companies must agree to allow their men to belong to unions. They must devise some machinery that will help to bring employers and employees together in conference. They must devise machinery

which will make it impossible for foremen or others to exercise arbitrary powers; and I think it would be well, if possible, for you to try to use your influence to have these principles adopted in the company in which you have an interest." I was writing him simply as an individual. Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., never knew when I went to Colorado what was in my mind; he never knew until the day he received a letter from me setting out these principles that I had ever thought of even communicating with him or with any one in connection with that company in regard to that situation. But I was not dealing with that question, ladies and gentlemen, because of any theoretical interest in it; I was dealing with it because it had to do with the lives and the welfare of human beings and the future of industry on this continent. So I took the step that seemed to me the practical one. And with what result? With the result that Mr. Rockefeller junior said to me: "Mr. King, if you will go out to Colorado again, and will talk to the managers of the company, and the men, in regard to the principles you have laid down, and if any influence of mine will be helpful in getting those principles adopted, I will go out and help you get them applied in this industry."

Before I went out—and I want to mention this particularly to Mr. Moore, because he has left the impression, I think, that the plan adopted subsequently was intended in some way to operate against the trades unions—before I went out I saw personally the president and the secretary of the United Mine Workers of America. I asked those gentlemen what they wanted to have done in the matter of unionism in Colorado—whether they were urging that a contract should be entered into between the company and the men, or whether there was any other particular stand that they were taking. What reply did they make? They spoke as reasonable men. They said: "Mr. King, the situation in Colorado has been such, owing to the state of civil war that has existed there, that it would be an impossible thing to expect any employer or group of employers to enter into an agreement with the United Mine Workers at this particular time. What we would like, if possible, is the recognition of the right of every man to join a union; and if the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company will give that right and see that is lived up to, we shall be more than satisfied at the present time." More than that, I told them what Mr. Rockefeller junior said to me, and they said: "If you go out, and if Mr. Rockefeller goes out, we will see that no officer of the United Mine Workers of America approaches you with a view to asking the recognition of a contract at the present time, provided you stand for the right of the men to join the union if they desire to do so." That was before I went out the second time.

I acted in accord with the views of those officers in the subsequent advice that I gave to the company in Colorado. I suggested that in any plan they drafted they should insert a clause stating that every man should have the right to join a union; that that should be one of the fundamental principles of the plan, whatever it might be. That is the reason why that clause is in the Colorado plan. It is not there to take away from any man the right to join a union, but to give to every man a right which he had not had before.

Now, what was the result of that visit of Mr. Rockefeller junior, and myself? A plan was drafted, in conference with the officers of the company, and the employees. Before that plan was accepted by one side or the other, it was fully explained to the men selected by the employees to go into conference for the purpose of discussing it and making suggestions in regard to it. Not only was it discussed in that way, but it was printed in thirteen different languages and circulated, because in those particular coal mines there are many foreigners employed. A secret ballot was taken among the workmen in the different camps—there were some twenty or twenty-three different mining communities affected—and with what result? The result was that 98 per cent of the workingmen voted to adopt that plan. That was the genesis and the origin of the Industrial Representation plan. That is how the plan came to have in it the clause to which I have referred; that is how it came to have in it a clause that no man was to be summarily dismissed; that is how it came to have in it a clause giving the right of appeal in case of any alleged injustice, and making provision for an appeal, not merely to the president of the company, but to the State of Colorado Industrial Commission. The last clause I urged very strongly, because I felt that the state had appointed the commission for the purpose of seeing justice done to labour. I said: "It stands for the rights of the people, the rights of the community, the fourth party to industry. In any plan you draw up you must recognize this fourth party. Make the final appeal in case of

dispute to the State Commission." The company agreed to this appeal to the State Commission, notwithstanding it is composed almost exclusively of labour men.

I might mention other clauses and explain them, but I think I have said sufficient to show the nature and purpose of the plan and its genesis. I would have had no part in the concern one way or the other if it had been even remotely intended for the purpose of fighting the unions. I believe in labour unions. I believe that the progress which has been made in improving labour's condition has been made in a larger measure through unions than any other institution that I know of. But I do not believe, for that reason, that everything the unions have done is right, or that their methods, on all occasions, are right. I believe that they are capable of rendering services to the world yet undreamed of; but that it will never be if there is an attitude of antagonism on the part of the unions on the one side and the employers on the other. It will be done only by showing the employers, who need educating just as much as labour does, the merits of operating with organized labour. I believe this plan in Colorado has had that effect.

Up to the time that the plan went into force the miners had not felt secure in joining unions, had not the right openly conceded; but where the plan went into effect they were free to join them. What is the position in Colorado to-day? A very large percentage of the miners are organized. When the plan was applied to the steel works of the Colorado Steel and Iron Company a large proportion of the men were already organized. The representatives on the joint committee's to-day are very largely union men. For the first time you have the employers and the officers of unions dealing together, and each is beginning to see the stuff that the other is made of; the employers are beginning to see the stamina of men who have to contend on behalf of those who have to struggle in the world's battle for an existence. Both sides find there is not so much dividing them. Prejudice is being beaten down, because they are getting to know there is a common humanity that unites all of us; that men do not differ very much in individuality whether they be on one side of a question or the other.

Let me just say this further word to illustrate the effect of the outcome of that plan. I want the facts to speak for themselves. I shall not make statements of my own. I ask you to look at the statement given out by the Fuel Administrator of the United States in regard to the output of coal during the war. I am not unmindful of what has been said about my alleged indifference to war service. Some day I shall have an opportunity of telling the people of Canada the kind of service that I tried to render the armies of the Allies, embracing our forces at the front. Meanwhile I ask you not to listen to my words, but to look at the statement issued by the Fuel Administration of the United States as to the output of coal from the mines of the United States while that country was in the war—coal that was needed for the steel industries that were engaged in turning out munitions; coal that was needed to carry ships across the sea; coal that was needed in Italy, in France, and in other countries, and what will you find? You will find that the greatest output of coal per man per day was from the mines of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company. That is not a statement of mine, but the official statement of the United States Government. There was less loss of working time, less loss of working days, of absence from work, in those mines than in any other mines in America. What accounts for that? Under this plan the men through their own representations were left to deal with the question of slackers themselves; they saw that the best energies of all the men were put into the work of getting out coal during the course of the war. These facts are more eloquent than any words, and why? Because they are the truth.

I think the statement was made by Mr. Moore, I am sure wholly unconsciously, that this plan deliberately cut into trades unions and tried to do away with the right to recognition of trades unions. I do not know about the Imperial Oil Company, because I have not had to do with it. I have seen their plan, and it seems to me in some particulars to be very much a copy of the plan of which I am speaking. But I can speak of one of the other oil companies, the Standard Oil Company of Indiana, which employs large numbers of men, where a plan somewhat similar exists at the present time. I cannot say what the facts are in regard to all their refineries; but in either White River or Sugar Creek, Mr. Moore will find that practically every man employed is a union man. He will find more than that: He will find that there are signed agreements between the union and the company. And I might tell him this. That for years the company and

the unions had been agreeing with each other by written memoranda and documents.

I was called into conference to advise the company on its relations with its employees. I am not betraying any secrets, I think, when I say that I drew attention to this method of dealing by memoranda, this seemingly unnecessarily subterranean method of making an agreement which purported to be an agreement, and yet not coming out and saying so. I said: "Why do you not put them into written contract form and let the people of the country see where you stand?" I do not know whether it was my advice that helped to bring it about, but the agreements are signed today, and they are working under this very plan.

These plans, as I had conceived them, viewed in a large way, are methods whereby the very thing that Mr. Moore hopes for, as perhaps no one else in this room hopes, may be accomplished; namely, bringing about gradually of confidence on the part of employers in the work of trades unions, where trades unions respect their contracts and control their labour. I think they have had that effect, already, and I think that unless we are big enough and strong enough not to care a continental for the prejudice that attaches to any name or any plan, but to look at the facts themselves, and judge on the merits, we will get nowhere.

So my belief and my advice is that while, as Mr. Strachan has well said, it would be a mistake to label any plan by any particular name, if you can see in anything, no matter what it is called, the thing that is making for right and justice and good, take it and make the best use of it that can be made; and with the use and development of it you will bring about in the end the larger object which you have in view. It is in that way that the British constitution has been worked out. The one big thought that workingmen and employers should have ever before them is that they are engaged in the mightiest task that has ever been set, that of building up a constitution for our industrial society, building up a constitution for industry which will put the man who works with his hands on the same level and on the same pedestal of honour as the man who works with his brain or in any other way. When we reach that equality we shall have no further fear of industrial strife, but will go on seeking the furthur improvement of the lot of our fellow men and the prosperity of our country.

Mr. A. C. HAY (Winnipeg): I have listened with great interest, Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates, to the very finest remarks of our esteemed friend, Mr. Mackenzie King. Knowing full well that he represents the Rockefeller plan, and knowing that I represent labour—it may be said that I misrepresent a certain group of labour, but I qualify that by stating that I represent what is recognized as the International Labour movement—I would state that I have in my hand a paragraph in regard to this beautiful steel corporation that Mr. King elaborates so greatly upon. It says:

Hasty Publication—Wilson and Company will confer at the White House to-day, and I hear that the President plans another appeal to the nation in which the Steel Trust will be rebuked for its stubborn refusal to grant collective bargaining.

That being so, I take the stand, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that we are here as labour representatives, not only to enunciate the idea of collective bargaining, and the principle of the recognition of unions, but to have a social democracy established by mutual understanding. I do not want to repeat anything that I said this morning; I do not want to cover any ground which has previously been covered; but if we want to arrive at a mutual understanding, I would ask the gentlemen of the Opposition and the gentlemen on this side of the room to confine themselves to Canadian questions and Canadian ideals. Although I was called in the press an imported Scotch agitator, I am a Canadian citizen, and I recognize that my children being born in Canada, I am here to represent the Dominion of Canada.

A DELEGATE: Is that One Big Union your policy now?

Mr. HAY: I do not understand my friend here at all; his remark is out of place. I am talking as a Canadian just now, but as an international officer paid from the American side by an organization with headquarters in Cincinnati and a branch office in Washington, D.C. My friend here asks me if I had something to do with the One Big Union. Well, I am out to fight the One Big Union, because I am an international officer. I maintain that force is no remedy; we must first find out the cause of the social unrest and apply the proper remedy. When it comes

to questions between workers and their employers I maintain that force is no remedy.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair desires again to remind speakers that they should confine their remarks to the subject under consideration, as time is passing rapidly.

Mr. HAY: Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that you have reminded me of that fact. I have been wandering in the Sahara desert, but I want to come back to state that as a representative of labour I am strongly opposed to the Rockefeller plan.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW (Woodstock, Ont.): Dealing with clause a of Item No. 5, we on this side have to say that if a bureau is to be established it must be run on non-partisan lines; it must not advocate any particular kind of Joint Industrial Councils. It might be promoted if the functions of the bureau were to be clearly defined as that of collecting and distributing information regarding all kinds of plans, where such are in operation including, of course, Whitley Councils, Individual Plant Councils, etc., together with the views of responsible persons who either support or oppose such plans. I move that the item be referred to the committee.

Mr. FRED WELSH (Vancouver): I believe that if any of the gentlemen here on the employers' side have any doubt as to the necessity of Industrial Councils, the only way to eliminate that doubt from their minds is to show them that it is good business. We will take the amount of time lost in useless strikes and unnecessary lockouts, when oftentimes by getting together groups from both the employers and employees these matters could be easily adjusted, to the benefit of both groups and that of the general public. I have had some experience in committees of this description; being interested vitally in two of them. Where they have been in operation we have found that by getting together we have been able to eliminate many petty grievances—mole hills which, without the work of the committee, would have become mountains. We know that many a strike has been started on small personalities passed between employers and employees, which have gradually grown until they assumed the proportion of a large strike. I have a case in mind where 2,500 men quit or a period of ten days owing to the discharge of one man from the works—a matter which I believe would have been totally unnecessary if a committee had been in existence, as it could have been satisfactorily adjusted in a very few moments.

I believe that possibly many employers have views too narrow to recognize the value of councils. Would it not be policy on the part of employers to have a Works Council operated by members of their firm and members from the regular workers meeting in a general conference and discussing their problems and the grievances of the workers? From that there might develop a Central Council for a section of country, at which every branch of industry would be represented, or every section of a trade. Surely it would be sure to the advantage of any employer to be able to meet with the other employers in his particular industry and form joint agreements throughout a whole section of country, so that their business could be brought to a common basis. Where the same wage scale and the same conditions apply in any industry, such a plan would be good for the employers as well as for the men. Only one body of men can be recognized in organizing such councils, because there is only one body organized.

Employers oftentimes look upon their employees as belonging to them, yet we in the Trades Union movement have often noticed that an employee will wander around from place to place as conditions of trade change. He may be working for one man this month, and for another man next month, but he expresses his views and sentiments through an organization, which in turn speaks for the whole of the men employed in that particular line of industry in any given district. I believe that if the employers really took these things into consideration they would find it to their mutual advantage to have such councils.

Trades unionists have forced themselves into the position of being, to some extent, a power in the land. Any one who has noted the rapid growth of the Trades Union movement, not only in this country but in every country in the world during the past four years, must realize that the workers are gradually organizing, and they will continue to do so until they are one hundred per cent organized throughout the whole of this country and every country. They have to do it, and they must make their ambition known through an organization, which under present conditions must be the Trades Union movement.

If you do not care to recognize the Trades Union movement there is only one thing we can do, and that is to continue on the lines we have adopted, namely, to fight, to

the disadvantage of both sides—loss by the employee of wages in strikes, loss to the employer in overhead expenses, and necessarily other expenses during the time that any strike is taking place in his plant. For that reason I believe the employers of this Dominion will realize the necessity of the Whitley scheme for councils in Canada. I am tempted to say that in my estimation this Conference is practically the first Whitley Council in Canada, for we are here to consider two sides of these questions, with the view of coming to a general agreement on various matters. That is one of the functions of the Whitley scheme.

As to what stand shall be taken in regard to the bureau, or what attitude we may adopt as to its personnel, I feel inclined to state that we will not take any specific attitude. I think that if we agree on the principle, the details will look after themselves; and I feel assured that this one step will tend more to bring together the employers and the workers of the Dominion of Canada for a common understanding of the business on the one side and the troubles and tribulations of the worker on the other.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. D. STRACHAN: Perhaps, I may be permitted at this stage, before the motion is seconded, to say just a word or two. Honestly, Mr. Chairman, I am fairly well satisfied with the debate, considering everything. I think we have got the matter fairly well before the Conference. One or two things I want to say to the leader of the debate on the other side. I surely should not require to say this; but honestly, Mr. Chairman, I am not spending my time, as a serious man, to defeat any organization; I am not putting my life and my service into this work of industrial relations for the purpose of upsetting any plan of any organization. It would be foolish to do that; the Company would be foolish. There is only one reason why our Company have done this, and I believe we may say that we are fairly the pioneers of this industrial relationship plan in Canada. As we were the pioneers in axle grease, and the first to put various things on the market that are making the wheels of industry run to-day, so we wanted to be pioneers with regard to our approach to the great problems affecting the industries of this country. It was not because of any trouble in the Imperial Oil Company that this plan was put into operation; it was not to defeat any strike. We put it into a plant that had been going for twenty-two years, and in that time there had never been any suspicion of any trouble; there had never been a strike, had never been a lockout and had never been any serious trouble between the men and the management. We introduced this into that plant that we might let the employees understand that we were anxious to come nearer to them, and anxious that they should come nearer to us; and it was part of the very spirit of the times that this thing grew.

Just this other word I want to say. A question was asked, and answered as frankly, by Mr. Moore on the other side. It was this: "Does this recognition of the Union mean the closed shop?" It was a square question, and it was squarely answered: "No, it does not mean the closed shop." But, did the speech that was made in reply to my remarks follow up the answer that was given to that question? I do not believe it did; I do not believe the speech was quite in accordance with that answer, because the Whitley plan does require 100 per cent unionized, and surely that means the closed shop. On the other hand, if the figures are correct as stated, that the growth of unionism during this year was 50 per cent over what it was before, why legislate? You are getting it so fast that you will have it. If that is the case, long before your legislation can be put into effect. Then why are you worrying about legislation? Let the thing go. If what you say is correct, that this year the union business has increased 50 per cent, you have the matter in your own hands, and what can we do about it? This is all I have to say, and I trust that in this matter, as in some other matters, we will be able to come to a fair understanding and do what is best for us and for the country.

Mr. WILLIS MACLACHLAN (Toronto): I do not wish it to be inferred that I am speaking for the whole of the third group, but I am speaking as an engineer, representing some ideas of engineers, and I am happy to have had the privilege of being present to take part in these proceedings. Neither am I speaking as an employer, as I might do, for it is not long ago that I was working thirteen hours on a night shift. I might also speak as an employer, because I am acting in an advisory capacity to practically every power organization in Ontario. I speak rather as having had something to do in connection with the

application of Joint Councils, as I have been dealing with committees of employees and employers for some four or five years.

In regard to the application of the so-called Whitley plan to Canadian conditions, I may say that on the 17th of last March, in the city of Toronto, I called a meeting of the representatives of contracting interests and their employees, and on the 1st of April an agreement was signed between those parties, who mutually decided on the various points leading up to what is now called the Toronto Building Trades Industrial Council. Since their first meeting I have not attended the Council, because I felt that it was a case of the duck and the water, and if it was going to swim I would be of no assistance, and I did not want to interfere between employer and employee. Before coming to this Conference I took the opportunity of asking the representatives of both sides as to how it was working out, and they said it was working with perfect satisfaction. I am willing to admit that that plan could not be applied to all industries in Canada. In the Building Trades in Toronto there was very complete organization on both sides, and it was not very difficult to put it into effect. The important point is that it was started, and that it is working. I am given to understand that it solved one strike and prevented two others, and that there is a mutual agreement as to the extension of the work during the coming winter.

In answer to the point raised by Dr. Strachan, that the Whitley plan means 100 per cent organization, in reading over any plan presented by the Whitley Councils or Joint Councils in England, I do not think you will find that 100 per cent representation is necessary for the carrying out of the plan.

Dr. STRACHAN: What word does it use? Does it not say "fully organized"?

Mr. MACLACHLAN: In carrying out the plan in Toronto neither the contractors nor the workers were completely organized, and yet we have a satisfactory working under the Whitley plan. I do not wish it to be inferred that I am talking here to back up the Whitley plan in opposition to all other plans; that is not right; but, as the statement has been made in this Conference that we do not want to import alien or foreign plans into Canada, and that possibly conditions in England and the United States do not compare with Canadian conditions, I wanted to point out that not only has the Rockefeller plan been carried out by the Imperial Oil company, in Sarnia and at its other plants, but that the Whitley plan has been carried out in Toronto and Ottawa in the building trades. The plan is possibly not entirely the Whitley, as the last part of it was taken from the last part of the International Harvester Company's plan, which was considered to be very applicable.

There are two points I wish to impress upon you. In working out your plan, do not get an elaborate one and then present it saying, "This is the best thing to do." If the men and the company get together and discuss and work out the plan that will apply to their particular conditions, they will get a far better result, as has been found on a number of occasions.

Mr. TOM MOORE: In rising to second the motion of Mr. Shaw relative to the reference to the committee, I desire to take advantage of the few minutes allowed, in order to reply to some statements made and questions enunciated by our good friend Mackenzie King. It would be a poor tribute to the brilliance of the political leader of one party in this country to say that he had not succeeded in convincing this audience that I was wrong on some of the points, at all events. We must realize this, however, that in the course of the remarks he made he particularly emphasized the fact that the Rockefeller plan was devised, not as a means of general application, but as a measure of relief where a civil war was obtaining. We are not in a state of civil war, and we do not want to be. Therefore there is probably no necessity for applying the same kind of plan when we have not the same conditions as a fundamental.

In relation to that, he drew attention to the fact that the Conference with the officers of the United Mine Workers, in which he asked them whether they were prepared to enter into an agreement with the company, or desired to do so—I think that was practically his question—and they replied no.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: No. I imagine you want the exact words. I asked, not if they were prepared to enter into an agreement, but what was their desire in the matter of a union contract—whether they were pressing for a union contract or whether they were pressing for the right of the men to belong to the union.

Mr. TOM MOORE: I want the correct words: whether they desired, or were pressing for, a union contract. I can well imagine, and so can any one else who has

studied the trades union movement and industrial strife, that at the end of an unsuccessful strike, when dogs, machine guns, militia and every known means had been used to rid the camp of the trades union element, the officers of that organization did not want to enter into a contract for the strike-breakers who had taken the places of union men at that particular time.

It has been pointed out that where this plan has been in operation the plants have become unionized. I would not want any one to assume, because I said that the policy of this plan was to prevent organization, that it was always successful. It was not, and it is a fact that, even in Colorado itself, the miners of that district have petitioned for the reinstatement of a branch of the United Mine Workers of America, stating candidly and frankly that after their experiment with the proposed company's plan they found it was a failure and they wanted ordinary trades unionism restored. This is the condition as vouched for by the records of the American Federation of Labour, which met in Atlantic City in June of this year. The report of the committee—which I have not with me—was that after full investigation of the many applications of the plan in the United States, the committee was unanimous in the opinion that the workers who had operated under that plan found it ineffective, not what they thought it was going to be, but a failure in so far as the accomplishment of industrial peace was concerned.

Now, one more thing. I do not want to go too closely into this, because my time is limited, but I want to say with reference to the growth of organization that there is no doubt that we are marking progress. My good friend asks, "If you have reached that stage so quickly, why do you want legislation? May I ask the gentleman opposite to remember the figures given by the Labour Department relative to the industrial strife of this last year and to the loss of working time. Organization has grown, but at what cost? What has been the price to the industry of this country? Do you want us to continue the growth of trades unionism at that cost to the opposing forces, through industrial stagnation? If that is so, we will get there. But we do not want to use the strike weapon to obtain that measure of justice in the development of organization; we want co-operation from your side to obtain it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the figures will be published next week at our Congress, and I think I know what I am speaking of, seeing that we have just completed our books. The figures which were published by the American Federation of Labour showing their growth, the figures which were published in Britain showing the growth of the trades union movement there to be 40 per cent—these indicate the trend and development of the human mind engaged in industry to-day. These figures are irrefutable. I do not want to say more on that point. The figures speak for themselves. The methods that we have had to adopt to reach that result also speak for themselves. If you want these, then this Conference has been a failure. If you want industrial peace and harmony, let us change from the methods of the past and bring in a resolution in harmony with the recommendations which have been previously made. I therefore, Mr. Chairman, second the motion that this question now go to Committee and that the Committee report back as soon as possible.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS

REPORT ADOPTED TO REFER REMAINING SUBJECTS ON AGENDA TO COMMITTEES WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN: I am asked to request the committee on arrangements, of which Mr. Magrath is Chairman, to meet immediately. Perhaps the Committee may have a report to make to the Convention before we adjourn. The members of the Arrangements Committee will kindly retire for a few moments.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Mr. Chairman, realizing the time which has arrived, Thursday evening, and the desire of many members, perhaps on both sides of the House, to get away as early as possible and yet to do justice to the various subjects, we are quite in harmony with a suggestion which has been made, that the remaining subjects should be referred direct to Committee, by common consent, without being first introduced in this assembly, and that the Committee be given an opportunity to-morrow morning to commence the preparation of their reports, so that definite conclusions may be arrived at. In moving that, Mr. Chairman, I desire to couple with it the suggestion that the rule allowing 20 minutes to the introducer should apply in the case of the Committee reporting back; that the one on each side who would have originally introduced the motion prior to the reference to Committee should have the same privilege of speaking for 20 minutes when the Com-

mittee reports back with the resolution it may present. We have no desire that these subjects should be smothered; they are important; only we feel that, as time is pressing, we should make one discussion of it, instead of having a discussion prior to and another discussion subsequent to the Committee's report. I therefore move accordingly.

Mr. J. R. SHAW: Mr. Chairman, I beg to second Mr. Moore's motion.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER: With reference, Mr. Chairman, to the motion which has been moved and seconded, I have been wondering if the Committee which just this moment has retired from the room is dealing with that very subject-matter. Perhaps it is within your knowledge. If the Committee is dealing with it, we might conceivably be passing something which is not in keeping with the recommendation that may be presented by the Committee.

Mr. TOM MOORE: If it is agreeable, Mr. Chairman, I might make my motion to refer this suggestion to that Committee for an immediate report.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER: I will see what the Committee is doing.

The CHAIRMAN: If Mr. Moore is agreeable, the motion can be put in the amended form. I do think the Committee is giving that very subject consideration.

Mr. TOM MOORE: I am quite agreeable to put it in that form, Mr. Chairman—that the question of the submission of the further items to the Committees, without reference to the Convention, be referred to the Committee on Arrangements, and that the rule relative to 30-minutes speeches for introducing discussions still apply.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion would then appear to stand in this form: it is moved and seconded that the Conference refer to the Committee on Arrangements the question of the desirability of altering the original plan, as outlined and adopted, for the purpose of saving time in the discussion of the matters still upon the agenda. This matter is now referred to that Committee, and I believe it will be ready to report in a few minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER: I have seen the Committee on Arrangements and advised it of what had taken place, and I understand it is at this moment considering that matter as having been referred to it according to the terms of the mootion as altered by Mr. Moore, and my expectation is that the Committee will be reporting in the course of a minute or two.

The CHAIRMAN: May I suggest that the Convention remain in session for a few minutes, pending the receipt of the Committee's report, so that we may dispose of that matter to-night..

The SECRETARY: This is the report of the Committee of Arrangements, who have given consideration to the question of our further procedure. It reads as follows:

It has been agreed by the Committee on Arrangements and is recommended to the Conference that, in respect of all the remaining subjects on the agenda, the same shall be referred to the appropriate Committees without preliminary discussion.

Also, that in the submission to the Conference of all reports of Committees already appointed or hereafter appointed, a total limit of forty minutes shall be allowed to either side for discussion.

The report was adopted.

MANUFACTURING PROFITS .

CORRECTION OF MIS-STATEMENT.

Mr. J. A. McCLELLAND: Mr. Chairman, reference was made before we adjourned the morning session to some figures that were submitted by me yesterday to this Convention. Some corrections were suggested of figures which were said to be absolutely incorrect. I desire to state that the figures as submitted by me were incorrect, and that the figures as stated by the speaker this morning are the correct figures, though the figures I submitted were taken from what was considered to be a fairly reliable journal. I wish that this statement may be made as public as the statement that I made previously.

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

The Conference adjourned until to-morrow at 10 a.m.

CANADA

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

of Dominion and Provincial Governments with Representative Employers and Labour Men, at Ottawa, September, 1919.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

FIFTH DAY.

CONTENTS.

Proportional Representation—Report of Committee favouring Early Government Investigation—Adopted Unanimously.
Addresses by Sir John Willison, E. S. Woodward, A. Monro Grier, J. H. Ashdown, Gus Francq.

Joint Industrial Councils—Report of Committee favouring them and recommending Government Information Bureau—Adopted Unanimously.

Unemployment, Sickness, and Old Age Insurance—Report of Committee favouring a Board of Inquiry—Widows' Pensions included—Adopted Unanimously.
Addresses by James Simpson, F. H. Whitten, W. B. Segsworth.

Minimum Wage Laws—Report of Committee favouring Extension of Laws and Further Investigation, and Better pay for Teachers—Adopted Unanimously.

Land Speculation and Housing—Resolution favouring Further Investigation—Referred to Committee.
Addresses by J. A. Flett, R. Parnell, E. S. Woodward.

Free Compulsory Education—Resolution favouring Better Provision in All Grades.
Addresses by Major M. A. Matheson, R. G. Henderson, Mayor Bouchard (St. Hyacinthe).

Freedom of Speech and the Press—Resolution Endorsing View of Royal Commission—Adopted Unanimously.
Addresses by E. G. Henderson, R. Thomson, L. Braithwaite, C. McCutcheon.

Employment and Unemployment—Resolution favouring Further Government Provision—Adopted Unanimously.
Addresses by T. A. Stevenson, Fred Welsh, E. S. Woodward.

The Senate Chamber,
Ottawa, Friday, September 19, 1919.

MORNING SESSION.

The Conference met at 10 a.m., Hon. Senator Gideon D. Robertson, Minister of Labour, presiding.

Mr. Gerald H. Brown acted as Secretary.

Mr. A. H. Dancy, of Toronto, has since Wednesday acted as substitute for Mr. H. T. Hamblin, of Winnipeg, as delegate representing the construction industries.

Mr. George Collins was present locally as a substitute delegate for Mr. W. L. Washlyo and T. Martin for J. J. Coughlan.

The name of Mr. A. Blackwood, as representing the Attorney General's Department of Saskatchewan, has been inadvertently omitted from the list of provincial representatives in attendance since the opening of the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the understanding reached last night, we will proceed this morning to receive the reports of Committees and to deal with those reports in the order in which the items are named in the agenda. Are there any committees ready to report?

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW: I understand, Mr. Chairman, that Committees 2, 3 and 4 are not yet ready, but that the Committees in respect of Items 5, 6 and 9 are ready. I do not know what arrangement has been made by the respective Committees as to who shall bring in their reports. Dr. Stratton was Chairman, I think, of Committee No. 5. I understand Sir John Willison presided in Committee No. 9 and is present.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE FAVOURING IMMEDIATE GOVERNMENTAL INVESTIGATION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

The CHAIRMAN: We will receive the report from Committee No. 9.

Sir JOHN WILLISON: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I have the privilege of submitting to you the report of the Committee on Proportional Representation. You will be glad to know, I am sure, that the report is unanimous. It is in these words:

> Believing that there are defects in the system of Electoral Representation in Canada, which defects are stated by the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations to be a contributory cause of social and political unrest, this Conference welcomes the declaration of the Prime Minister, on behalf of the Government, that a Speaker's Conference will be called to investigate the merits of the Proportional System, and urges that such action be taken without delay.

In submitting the report and moving its adoption I have only a very few observations to offer. So far as I am personally concerned, I regard Proportional Representation not particularly or peculiarly as a concession to labour. I think we all, or at least most of us, agree that it is desirable that there should be a greater direct representation of labour—of organized labour, if you like—in the House of Commons; and all of us who have attended this Conference will also agree, I believe, that on the floor of this Chamber there are men and women who would add to the distinction and dignity of the Canadian Parliament.

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN WILLISON: But I submit that Proportional Representation, while it may insure a certain representation of labour in Parliament, is deeply desirable—I am speaking for myself only—because in its operation and in its incidence it will permit of a fairer, juster, and more influential representation of all classes in the House of Commons, and will insure that not only the minorities which represent labour but minorities who may represent other interests in this country which ought also to be represented in a true democracy, will all have a better and fairer representation in Parliament than we are likely to have under the conditions which are developing in this and other so-called democratic countries.

I was reminded during the sittings of the Committee of an incident in Australia. The Labour group in Australia, while the Liberal party was in office, petitioned for Proportional Representation, and the petition was denied. A few years later the Labour party obtained power in Australia, and the Liberal group petitioned for Proportional Representation, and this petition was denied.

I do not believe that any democracy is a true democracy which does not ensure the representation on the floor of Parliament not only of labour but of those who represent the important financial and commercial and industrial interests of Canada. Just in proportion as we have found the wisdom of meeting together in this Conference and discussing vital questions face to face, so a system of representation which truly expresses the spirit and temper of democracy can only be achieved by a system of representation which will ensure a reasonable representation of each.

If you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, I would say, in closing, that I think that it is a great pity that labour and agriculture have not had greater representation in this Chamber. Of course, I will not suggest, with all respect for the Chairman, that many gentlemen of your age would come to this Chamber, because I have often said that no young man ever comes to this House and no old man ever leaves it. Proportional Representation, or some system of minority representation, is not a new experiment. It has been tried in many other countries, and, upon the whole, the results have been favourable. While it may be a new experiment on this continent, I am not impressed by the suggestion that we should always wait on the experience of other countries. I am bound to say that I covet for my country the leadership in the forward march towards the upland. While, in speaking from public platforms, I very rarely refer to the achievements of Canadian soldiers in France—because I rather dislike the babble and the gabble of pious and patriotic phraseology—at the same time I believe the final judgment of history will be that there never were better soldiers than those who went from this country to the old world. I take that as proof of the efficiency of the Canadian people. I believe we are as efficient in industry and in labour as we were on the field of battle, and, subject to the conditions which affect industrial competition, I hope that in this country we shall not be too fearful of experiments which go in advance of other countries and shall not always feel that we must lag behind instead of going ahead.

I have great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in moving the adoption of the report.

Mr. E. S. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, it is the desire, I believe, that I should

briefly present a statement of Proportional Representation for the benefit of those who are not very familiar with the subject, and who desire, before casting their votes, to know perhaps a little more about it.

In the first place, there is a desire animating all sections of this Conference, and I believe nearly every section of the country, that a happy and peaceful solution of industrial problems and political problems shall be reached. This desire, however, must be translated into definite action, because at the present time there are causes of industrial unrest for which we have not found a remedy. During the past few months we have seen in the city of Winnipeg a very serious outbreak. Whether it be viewed from the standpoint of capital or labour, or from the national standpoint, we will all agree that it was most deplorable. It certainly has not advanced the cause of trade-unionism in the West; it certainly has not aided in the production of commodities of national necessities; and, from every standpoint, it was a national calamity. We have seen in the Old Country recently large masses of men threatening to ignore Parliament in securing their demands and adopting direct and perhaps not quite desirable methods of obtaining their desires. In the United States there are large numbers of men who are pledged, in the first instance at least, to promote something like the socialization of the railways. It will depend on the institutions of that country whether those men will continue to the end to pursue constitutional means.

This unrest, according to the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, is partly due to lack of confidence on the part of certain sections of our people in our constituted Government. On page 12, section 67 o fthe Report, I will read so that there will be no misquotation—it says:

> The complaint was made at several places that legislation enacted at the request and for the benefit of labour was not adequately enforced, nor was the rise in the cost of commodities controlled in the manner that they believed it was possible for the Government to control it. The belief appears to be entertained that the governments, both local and federal, are largely controlled by the financial interests, and that their influence was manifest not only in legislation but in the executive action of the several governments. As evidence of this they pointed to the large profits which, according to the public press, were made by corporations dealing in foodstuffs and other necessary commodities, excessive rents, etc. These considerations, it was alleged, had shaken the faith of the working classes in governments as at present constituted.
>
> The remedy suggested was a system of election by which the worker could secure better representation in Parliament. The means suggested for bringing this about was the adoption of a system of proportional representation from grouped constituencies. We understand this system has been in operation for several years in Belgium and in Sweden—

and I might add in several other countries—

> and we believe the proposal is well worth serious study by a committee of Parliament.

We are assembled here, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, to evolve a solution of industrial unrest. The world is watching our efforts this week in the hope that we shall succeed in restoring the confidence of the working masses of this country in constitutional authority. For that reason it gives me great pleasure to second Sir John Willison's motion that the report of the Committee be adopted.

I believe that, in this report, should we adopt no other resolution during this sitting, this Conference, shall have given one long step towards solving the industrial unrest problem. In this connection might I point out the present composition of the House of Commons, in order to show that the working class are justified in the dissatisfaction which exists among them as to their present representation. The present composition of the House of Commons at Ottawa, according to the trades and professions of the men sitting there, is as follows: 78 lawyers, 67 of other professions, 72 merchants, and manufacturers, 4 representatives of labour, and 32 farmers. In other words, in a total representation of 231 there are but two direct representatives of labour, one of whom, I may say, I believe was returned as a Liberal and is included here as a labour representative, simply because he has shown sympathy toward the aspirations of labour.

Now, we have no particular objection to the members of the legal fraternity—we have one in this assembly who has a genial face, and underneath that pajama suit we believe, is a human heart—I would submit that if the Government had said to the legal fraternity: "We wish you to retain the great bulk of the members of this Conference on Industrial Relations; we will entrust to you the retaining of 78 out of 231," and, turning to the professions, if they had said, "We will give you 67," and to the employers had said, "We will give you 72," and had then said to labour, "We will give you 2," I really think that the

unrepresentative character of the assembly would have been very evident to the whole country. In the hope of reaching a solution of their problems they had to adopt other methods, yet His Majesty, in sending out the call for Parliament, was confined to the working of an antiquated system which gives very great misrepresentation to the classes as they exist in this country.

I have also here the total figures grouped together of the Senate, the House of Commons and the provincial assemblies of this country. At the present time there are in them all 6 labour men, 161 farmers, and 714 professional and business men. On a percentage basis that works out as one-half of one per cent representing labour, 18.3 per cent representing those interests which orcent representing those interests which organized labour, right or wrongly, believes not capable of fairly representing their viewpoint. We have in this Dominion, according to the last census, about a million and a half of workers, constituting 45.2 per cent of the total, we have 933,735 farmers, or 34.3 per cent of the total; and 557,473 business and professional men, or 20.5 per cent of the total. Therefore, in the House of Commons, according to the professions, the representation should be: labour, 45.2 per cent, or 400; farmers, 34.3 per cent, or 303; business and professional men, 20.5, or 181. This constitutes a menace which Lord Selborne recently dealt with in a letter to the London Times, dealing with a similar condition in the Old Country. With your permission, I will read the letter. It says:

The Editor, The Times.

You have drawn attention to the fact that there is a constitutional side to the industrial problem with which we are confronted, and you have pointed to the necessity for devolution. I much hope that you will recur to this subject again and again, but may I point out that that is not the only constitutional aspect of the case?

The last House of Commons rejected Proportional Representation in the Franchise Bill. It is important, I think, that the result should be noted, and what an intimate effect it has had on the industrial problem.

At the last general election the Labour party polled in contested seats in Great Britain 2,292,102 votes. This poll entitled them to 120 seats in Great Britain in respect of the contested constituencies alone, but the total number of seats they obtained in contested and uncontested constituencies was 59. The result is that the Labour party know that they are not fairly represented in the House of Commons, and many of their leaders, whose presence they consider essential to the proper consideration of their business have failed to obtain seats in the House of Commons. The consequence is that they look less and less to the House of Commons as the place where the questions which interest them can be properly considered and dealt with, and that there is an ever-increasing tendency to deal with these questions outside Parliament.

As the questions at issue are no longer only concerned with wages and conditions of employment, but are strictly political questions, such as whether an industry should be nationalized and whether it is possible in a civilized country for two governments to exist side by side, the one representing the whole community and the other a section of the community, this fact is fraught with danger.

At the next general election nothing is more probable than that the Unionist party will poll a sufficient number of votes to entitle them to a representation of 200 or more, but that the number of Unionist members returned will be under 100. Per contra, the Labour party may receive gross over-representation, but that will be no remedy for past injustice, it will be only aggravation of the evil.

I want to associate myself with Lord Selborne when he says that over-representation of labour will be no remedy for past injustice and will only aggravate the evil. It is confidently submitted for the earnest consideration of this Conference that an electoral system which operates so unequally and unjustly, and which hampers the workers in their efforts to find a constitutional remedy for their wrongs, is a standing incentive to the adoption of unconstitutional weapons.

The immediate effect on our labour parties has been noted. At the last election, speaking for the workers in the West, if not in the East, there was a very strong feeling against the passage of the Conscription Act. We are not here to discuss the merits or the demerits of the Act; but the labour men in most places were confronted with the necessity of either deserting their party and casting their votes for Conservative or Liberal candidates or having the mortification of wasting their votes. If you pick up the election returns you will see that eighty or ninety or one hundred thousand votes were cast for labour candidates; but that is not a true index of the situation, because many men did not vote for the labour candidate because of the Conscription Act. I, myself did not vote for a labour candidate at the last election precisely on that account. I voted for the Liberal party, because I believed that they stood a better chance of defeating the Military Service Act, and my vote was lost, as I think were those of thousands of labour men who were in the same position. The present system also discourages the very nomination of labour candidates. A great many labour men at the last election lost their deposits. Under the proportional system they would have had sufficient strength to send a great many repre-

sentatives to the House, but under the existing system their candidates were penalized if they failed to poll a vote equal to half of that of the successful candidate, and for that reason labour candidates were not nominated at all.

It would be a very great mistake, perhaps, to say that Proportional Representation is urged in the interest of any one section of the community. I may say, in passing, that there are many labour men who oppose proportional representation. They say that the flowing tide is with labour, that throughout the world the ranks are becoming more and more true to labour candidates, and that in the near future we shall be able to reap all the advantages of the present system. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald I believe, is one, in the Old Country who does not look at this matter from the broad standpoint, but merely from that of party advantage, and from that standpoint he can easily see that in the next few years, possibly the next few months, the Labour party will be able to reap all the advantages of the present pernicious elective system. So that this reform is not urged in the interests of labour, but in the interests of the nation. It is true, in the language of Asquith, that " a legislative assembly should be the mirror of the public mind, and that Parliament should be truly representative of all sections of the community.

I want to show that under our present system minorities often fail to find representation; that at other times minorities are grossly over-represented; and that at other times the very pressure of minorities increases the political strength of their adversaries. On a former occasion I remarked that those Britishers who imagine they are under representative governments are living in a fool's paradise, for there is nothing representative about it. It is sometimes over-representative, often under-representative, generally un-representative, and invariably mis-representative, but representative never.

In 1904 the 18 seats in the Dominion House of Commons allotted to Nova Scotia were secured entirely by the Liberal party, notwithstanding the fact that the Conservatives polled 46,000 votes, while the Liberals polled 56,000 votes. Under the proportional system the Conservatives would have had 8 seats and the Liberals 10 seats. I ask you whether the interests of Nova Scotia would not have been better served by having a strong Opposition to criticise the actions of the Government?

In the Federal election of 1921 there were 26,000 Conservative votes polled in British Columbia which secured 7 seats, while 18,000 Liberal votes failed to secure a single representative; but the proportional system would have given the Conservatives 4 and the Liberals 3, and I believe it would have been in the interest of the country if those 3 Liberals had come to Ottawa. The total disfranchisement of those minorities deprived the country of the benefits of a live opposition.

I will now deal with the over-representation of minorities, and I want to emphasize this particular point because of some remarks recently attributed to Sir Robert Borden, in which he seemed to be under the delusion that at least there was this advantage in the existing system—although he did not defend it, in fact he was saying a good word for Proportional Representation—that he thought the present system tended to give the Government a good working majority, which was important in the national interest. Let us see whether that is carried out.

In 1886 Gladstone was defeated in the general election fought on the Home Rule issue. In the Commons he found himself facing a hostile majority of 104; and, according to the press of the time, the country had overwhelmingly defeated the Home Rule solution of the vexed Irish racial issue. Yet an examination of the election returns covering the whole country shows that Home Rule received a majority of 55,000 votes. In view of the fact that very many of Gladstone's former opponents are now converted to the Home Rule solution, and in view of the events of bloodshed and riot which have since then accompanied every attempt to deal with the question by other means, the British have had good reason to regret the existence of a pernicious electoral system.

In the Canadian elections of 1896 the Liberals were in a minority of 21,000 votes in the country, yet, owing to the unrepresentative nature of our institutions, they had a majority of 30 seats in the Commons.

In the Irish elections of 1918, the revolutionary Sinn Fein party received 493,769 votes, while the constitutional parties received 433,578 votes. The revolutionists were thus in a minority of 20,000. It is disquieting, therefore, to notice that our present unjust and absurd disproportional system gave them a majority of 18 seats, and large numbers of persons entertained the delusion that Sinn Fein had swept the country.

I will next deal with my third point, which is, that the presence of a minority very generally increases the representation of the majority. In the days of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain the voting population of Birmingham was 70,000, and it was entitled to 7 seats. Approximately 40,000 of the voters were Conservatives and 30,000 were Liberals. Except for the presence in Birmingham of these 30,000 Liberals, the city would have been entitled to 4 seats only. It therefore follows that the minority were not only not represented, but they actually increased the parliamentary strength of their opponents by 3 seats.

In the city of Toronto in 1911 there were enough votes to entitle the city to 5 seats. The five members elected were all Conservatives, despite the fact that two-fifths of the votes cast were Liberal. Had these Liberals not been on the voters' list the city would have been entitled to 3 seats only. The very presence of the minority, therefore, added to the representation of the Conservatives.

I therefore claim that I have demonstrated what I set out to prove: (1) that under our present system minorities oftentimes fail to find representation; (2) that at other times minorities are able to obtain such a degree of over-representation as to command a majority of seats in Parliaments; and (3) that oftentimes minorities are not only left without representation, they are actually victimized by increasing the strength of their opponents.

There is one other glaring anomaly of the present electoral system which may well receive attention at this point. Consider the undue influence exercised by the small proportion of electors who easily change their political allegiance. These voters are largely responsible for what is know as the swing of the pendulum. This portion of the population, which fluctuates at the party elections, amount to just 2 per cent; yet we hear that the Liberals were hurled from power and the Conservatives elected, and that the whole country had changed its political thinking, while as a matter of fact all these elections were determined by but a small proportion of the votes cast.

In the general election of 1908 the Liberals of Canada obtained a majority of 49 seats. If only 22,000 voters, about 2 per cent of the total, had voted Conservatives instead, the majority would have been wiped out. In other words, 22,000 voters virtually controlled 49 seats, and through them the political destiny of the country for a period of years. Such a condition is intolerable.

In order to distribute my political allusions quite impartially, I will also mention that in the 1911 elections the Conservatives obtained a majority of 47 seats. If 23,000 voters less than 2 per cent of the total votes polled, had changed their allegiance, that majority would have been wiped out. Again it is true to remark that the Government of Canada was determined by those 23,000 voters.

This leads us naturally to my next point, which is one of the great and burning evils of our present system. Campaign managers fully realize that it is with only 2 or 3 per cent of the electors that they have really to deal, and it is that fact which leads them to stoop to those methods of debauchery, bribery, and public corruption that have been the disgrace of this and other countries for a great many years. One of the first men I met in Canada after landing here some eleven years ago, when sitting down at a dining-table, got into conversation with me. I spoke to him of politics, a subject in which I have always evinced some interest, and asked, "Well, how did you vote at the last election?" He replied, "I received $5 from the Liberal party to vote Liberal, and I received $10 from the Conservative party to vote Conservative, but I voted Socialist." While that situation may have its humorous sides, I think all of us, as men particularly responsible for the welfare of this country, having some desire that our children shall grow up with high conceptions of purity and honour, must see that that poor fellow, who was perhaps in need of $15 to buy his meals, was debauched and corrupted by that act, which equally corrupted those parties that offered him the money. Whether or not any of you gentlemen have ever felt yourselves compelled, through the inequities of our system, to depart from the strict path of rectitude in conducting your elections—and I have personal knowledge of men in very high places who have not been able to maintain the standard which they set for themselves when they entered public life—yet I submit that surely all of us should do what we can to overthrow a corrupt and degrading system. Let me remind you that one of the most honoured of our Governors General, Earl Grey, on his death-bed thought that this subject was so important that he wrote a letter to the London Times, in which he made very strong comments

which I think should receive due consideration from gentlemen here this morning. He wrote:

> In Canada the anxiety of the two contending parties to obtain an electoral majority in every district is a corrupting influence which poisons the very life of the people from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I submit that Earl Grey cannot be quoted as a labour agitator, or as a man with a distorted view of life; yet here is a man who soberly and calmly believed our present system to be a corrupting influence right from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I want here to make an allusion which appeals to me. It may conflict with the political opinions of some here, but I ask them to pardon me, because it at least represents the views of those in the West for whom I claim to speak. I say that it was doubtless the necessity for maintaining this system that caused the Government of Canada, shortly before the last general election, to stoop so low as to enact a measure disfranchising a great many citizens, in direct violation of those sacred engagements entered into when those same citizens were first induced to enter the country.

There is still one other evil influence about our present system which may be touched upon, which happily is passing away from our political life, though it still exists in places. I refer to the old scheme that we know as the gerrymander which consists of shifting the boundary lines of constituencies so as to give unfair advantage to one party over another. Most of you who have had anything to do with redistribution Bills know something about gerrymander, and those little political influences that sway the parties in changing the boundaries of constituencies.

Now I hope I have indicated to the satisfaction of everybody that there is something wrong with our present electoral method. Where is the weak spot in the present system? It lies in the existence of single-member constituencies. It is obvious that a majority of one in each constituency in Canada would give the entire representation to one party and deny all representation to the others. Thus a bare majority of 231 in the whole of Canada would, if evenly distributed amongst the constituencies, carry the entire 231 seats. That is a theoretical possibility; of course, we can dismiss it as a practical question, but it shows the absurd lengths to which this system could be carried. Fifty per cent of the electorate would then be represented, to the complete disfranchisement of the other fifty per cent. The remedy lies in dealing with the cause, which is the single-member constituency. The remedy lies in abolishing these single-member constituencies, and substituting multi-member districts. Thus, in a single-member constituency, one must be elected and the other defeated, even though there is a difference of only one vote. In a two-member constituency it could be arranged so as to give two parties representation. In a three-member constituency it could be arranged to give three parties representation, so you might have two of one party and one of another, according to the proportionate strength of the contestants.

But that is not sufficient. Besides introducing the multi-member constituency it is necessary to abolish plural voting. In most of our municipal councils, where there is more than one member to be returned, we generally give the voter the privilege of starting at the top and working down. I remember that at a recent election in the city of Victoria there were about 36 candidates for 12 seats; and the difficulty of working through the 36 and marking for the 12 whom you desired to elect was very considerable. Under the proportional representation system it is only necessary that you vote for one candidate, and you will find that this system gives you the sort of representation that we claim to be desirable. Thus, in a constituency entitled to two seats with 1,000 voters, 501 Conservatives and 499 Liberals, if each Conservative had two votes they would elect both of their men, and the Liberals would not find representation. But if each Conservative could vote only for one man, and each Liberal could vote but for one man, you would find that both would have representation. But two-member constituencies would be very undesirable, because they would afford no room for third parties, and under that system the Labour party would not be able to find representation. It is necessary to have, not two, or even three, but not less than five; and probably even seven. This would give the most desirable results. It is obvious that a two-seat constituency leaves no room for third parties.

The task of illustrating the proportional representation system is somewhat difficult, but I will attempt it. We will assume that there are 300 delegates here this morning, divided into 150 employers and representatives of employing interests, 100 representing labour interests, and 50 representing the

interests of the third party. According to Mr. Mackenzie King, the third party consists of some quantity, unknown to me, called the general public; but when I look into their faces I find they are all representatives of either capital or labour, so I cannot see where the general public functions.

Hon. Mr. DUNNING: No farmers there.

Mr. WOODWARD: I notice that on the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations the Government gave representation to capital and labour and the general public; but the latter consisted of one railway conductor and one representative employer. So, after all, as to this third constituency for which Mr. Mackenzie King pleads, he just goes over the ground again, saying: "One, two—and then back again—three, four," in arriving at his four sections of the country. That is by the way. If we have 300 delegates here, divided into 150 employers, 100 labour and 50 of the third group, and we are called on to elect a committee of six under proportional rules, how shall we go about it? We shall imagine that there are nine ante-rooms, and that on each room there is the name of one of the candidates for election on this committee. We will imagine that Mr. Shaw's name is on a neat brass plate, as befitting the dignity of this assembly, also the names of Mr. Grier and Mr. White, as the candidates for the employers' interests; that Mr. Moore and Mr. John Bruce and Mr. Simpson are representing labour, and that Sir John Willison and Col. Carnegie and Mr. Magrath are representing this Third Group. Now, how are we to proceed on proportional rules to secure that each party shall find fair representation, for you will at once admit that under existing rules the employers could elect all six men on that committee. We will ask each one to go to one of those rooms—to go into the room of the man for whom he wishes to vote. Each delegate walks into the room of the man for whom he desires to vote, and we find that 75 have walked into Mr. Shaw's room, 50 into Mr. Grier's room, 25 into Mr. White's room, 60 into Mr. Moore's, 30 into Mr. Bruce's, 10 into Mr. Simpson's, 25 into Sir John Willison's, 15 into Col. Carnegie's, and 10 into Mr. Magrath's. You will at once observe that it requires only 50 votes to elect anybody. Any candidate who receives 50 votes should be elected. There are 300 electors and six men to be elected, and 300 divided by six is 50; therefore any man securing 50 should be able to find representation. So Mr. Shaw finds himself in the happy position of having enough to elect him and 25 votes to spare. The returning officer walks into Mr. Shaw's room and says: "You may all stay here if you like, but I warn you that 25 of you are wasting your votes; if you want to walk into the room of one of the other employers, so as to improve his chances, why, go ahead."

The CHAIRMAN (Sir John Willison): The speaker has rather exceeded his time and I doubt if we can allow any speaker to exceed his time for the remainder of this Conference. I do not want, however, to close off the speaker if he desires to make a few concluding observations.

Mr. WOODWARD: I recognize the justice of your decision, Mr. Chairman, and I am perfectly prepared to bow to it.

Mr. J. S. MACLEAN: While the ruling is perfectly right, I would suggest that the speaker be given sufficient time to complete in the briefest terms the illustration which he has begun.

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWARD: I thank the gentlemen on the other side for their courtesy, and I will be just as brief as I can so as not to break the rules. I was going to say that the 25 surplus voters from Mr. Shaw's room will then, if they wish to vote for an employers' candidate, go into Mr. White's room and will give him their votes. He will then have 50 votes, which are sufficient to elect him. The employers will therefore have three representatives for their 150 votes. That is under Proportional Representation rules.

Mr. Moore finds himself with ten votes to spare. So the returning officer walks into Mr. Moore's room and says: "Gentlemen, you may stay where you are if you wish, but if you are sincerely desirous of electing some other Labour candidate, ten of you have the privilege of walking into one of the other rooms." So, if they are wise they will walk into the room of Mr. Bruce and will bring his vote up from thirty to forty. Then the returning officer will walk into the room of Mr. Simpson, who has just ten votes, and he will say to these ten voters: "You are wasting your time here; you cannot elect Mr. Simpson; he has only ten votes and he needs fifty. If you want to stay here, there is nothing to compel you to leave, but I suggest that you walk into some other room." They

simply walk to Mr. Bruce's room and give him their votes, so that he may have the desired fifty. Two Labour men would therefore be returned on exactly the same principle.

I do not think I need repeat the illustration to show what would be done in the other case in order that the Third Group might have one representative. I suggest that this equitable result would not be possible under existing rules, and it is possible under the Proportional rule. It is in a spirit of utter impartiality that I am advocating Proportional Representation.

Of course, I am not advocating the use of large numbers of committee rooms in a real proportional election. I am not asking that voters shall remain in person until advised by the returning officer of the result of the preliminary count. The voter can leave his instructions with the returning officer on a power of attorney known as a ballot paper. And, instead of being sorted into rooms, these voting papers can be sorted into pigeon-holes. The ballot papers need only to be marked with figures instead of with crosses, and the returning officer will know exactly what the wishes of the voter are. The figure 1 will indicate the elector's first choice. If the person thus voted for has too many votes the ballot paper will be transferred into the pigeon-hole of the candidate against whose name the figure 2 appears; and so on. The system is simplicity itself, and in practice it gives what the name implies, that is, an assembly in which all parties find representation in proportion to their voting strength. I could go on to show that the system is working successfully in many parts of the civilized earth. I could prove by a cloud of witnesses that it is now supported by many who were at first doubtful of its practicability. I could demonstrate that the world's greatest thinkers have given unqualified endorsation to the Proportional Representation System. If I now refrain from producing these proofs it is because I have been requested by the Chairman to conclude as briefly as possible.

May I be permitted, Mr. Chairman, to close with one passage from an old friend of mine, of whom I am very fond—Mr. John Ruskin. As I said, I am not advocating this measure as a matter of expediency. Therefore, I will conclude with these words of Ruskin:

> All endeavour to deduce rules of action from balance of expediency is in vain. And it is meant to be in vain. For no human actions ever were intended by the Maker of men to be guided by balance of expediency, but by balances of justice. He has therefore rendered all endeavours to determine expediency futile for evermore. No man ever knew, or can know, what will be the ultimate result to himself, or to others, of any given line of conduct. But every man may know, and most of us do know, what is a just and unjust act. And all of us may know also, that the consequences of justice will be ultimately the best possible, both to others and ourselves, though we can neither say what is the best, or how it is likely to come to pass.

I urge Proportional Representation, not because of its expediency, but because it is eternally just.

Mr. A. MONEO GRIER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I understand that there is no other report immediately ready; otherwise I should hesitate about saying anything at all. And even though there is nothing ready, I propose not to be long in what I say to you this morning.

May I say at once that I am speaking with extreme pleasure. Not that I pretend in any way to represent any corporate view; I am speaking entirely as an individual. I wish to make just an allusion, first of all, to what might be called the corporate view, namely this: that neither those on the other side nor those on this need be in the least concerned nor have any difference, in their individual minds, as to the expediency or inexpediency of Proportional Representation. The view of the committee, as very succinctly and clearly stated by Sir John Willison, is that the committee approves of an investigation into the merits of this system, and as I take it, so far as we all are concerned, we may quite cheerfully vote in favour of the resolution of the committee itself. Having said that, may I go on to say just a few words from my own individual standpoint.

In the first place, I should like to say, very willingly and from the bottom of my heart, that I feel we are all greatly indebted to the previous speaker for having so clearly set forth the system which is now under consideration. It relieves me of the necessity of saying anything at all upon that point. I wish now to say that it appeals to me very much. I do not profess to have any established view upon the question, and that is one reason why I said in my opening remarks that we had this morning no definite commitment, and you will see that it is a case of love at first sight. My acquaintance with this matter dates from breakfast-time yesterday, when a gentleman was kind enough to hand to me some literature upon the subject. I found that instantly I vol-

comed it to my heart. It seemed to me that it threw light upon dark places, and it occurred to me that perhaps it showed how we might really arrive at something like a true representation, not alone in this country, but in any country in the world.

Sir John Willison made no personal reference; his modesty would prevent his doing so; and yet I could not help deploring the fact that, whether it be due to the demerits of the present system or not, we have this to lament—an exceedingly unfortunate thing—that not only Sir John Willison himself, but any man of like kidney, is not at the present time within the walls of Parliament.

Now, I wish to allude to one or two statements made by the other speaker. He made reference to the late Earl Grey. It seems to me that we on this side of the House should take the opportunity to endorse the fine encomiums paid to him by that speaker. In the passing of Earl Grey there unquestionably, to my mind, passed away one of the finest types of citizen of the British Empire——

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER——a man who realized, as I am afraid all of us fail to realize, at all events constantly, that in the consideration of our rights we far too commonly forget our obligations. There is a wonderful truth in the old French motto, "Noblesse oblige", and I would suggest, not alone to the other side, nor to this side with them, but to the Third Group and to all in this country, that we too frequently are concerned about obtaining our rights when perhaps much more fittingly we should be concerned about the discharge of our civil duties. And I have the philosophy to believe that he who best discharges his duties eventually comes into those things which are really his rights; for, after all, rights do not consist in the power or the opportunity to acquire things material, but, as I conceive it, in the opportunity so to allow the quality of one's mind and heart and soul to grow that each day longer spent upon this terrestial globe, with all its sad sorrows but great joys, the owner of this heart and soul is a greater being to-day than he was yesterday, and may hope to be still greater on the coming morn.

I do take a very great interest in this subject of Proportional Representation. It has always seemed to me a matter of great regret that, as things stand at present, there is almost a premium paid upon extreme views. The man who is best regarded at the caucus of any party is the man who most extremely states the view of his party, and the man who, at the inception of his political career had higher notions, is almost driven to the adoption of catch-phrases, or anything that is likely to inflame the audience that he addresses, so that presently he loses his moderation and his appreciation of logic in his desire to achieve rhetoric which may captivate the audience. And so it comes to pass that a man who originally had fine parts, is constantly degraded when perchance he is apparently on the ascending scale. I pay my tribute to the man who in the hurry and turmoil of politics keeps his own soul so that he is unspotted of the world at the end of his career. Any man who does that gets from me a greater laurel wreath than any other man. I had rather be an absolute failure, as the world calls it, and yet be able to say that I am the captain of my own soul, than achieve anything that you care to offer me in the way of wealth or power, and at the end feel that I am actually and in the secrecy of my own chamber a degraded man as compared with what originally I was. This I do not charge to the individual; I attribute it in large part to what have seemed up to date to be the inevitable accessories of political life, and any man who refuses to change himself in order to capture others seems to me to have a far better opportunity under such a system of representation as is now suggested than he has under the present one.

Let me pass to the next point, which is more or less definite, with regard to professions. In the list of the present members of Parliament we find that there are a vast number of lawyers. May I, speaking as a lawyer, and with no sort of discourtesy to my fellow professional men, utter an expression of regret that there is so great a proportion of them. But, mind you, it is quite natural. You ask me why. A legislative assembly is one in which the process of speaking is constantly going forward. Who should be men who could speak? Inevitably those who are constantly charged with the duty of speaking for the rights and the interests of others. So it naturally comes about that lawyers gravitate to legislative assemblies; and in large part they discharge their duties finely, and, so far as method and form are concerned, they are conceivably the best possible representatives you can have.

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. GRIER: Of course, I am speaking far too earnestly to be making any personal allusions, and you will not misinterpret what I say. While as to method and form that is largely true, you run the risk of having men so constantly concerned about the forms of words and expression that they may fail to get at the reality of matters; and frequently, in the contemplation of the things which affect the community at large, I would rather have a man, I care not how ignorant, who knows something of the needs of human nature, than the best educated man of the community if he is absolutely soulless and has no regard for the need of his brother. So it is perhaps inevitable that there should be many lawyers in Parliament, though some of you may be reminded of an expression made with reference to Lord Brougham, who was of course a very great man, but conceivably not a very great lawyer, though he was Lord Chancellor, because of him it was said that he would have known a little of everything if he had known a little of law.

Now let me pass to the general idea as to the right to representation on the part of the different portions of the community. Unquestionably that should be the case. The speaker brought out a point as to danger and safety. This is my notion as to danger and safety with regard to the popular vote. If you wish to have, at all events in our splendid Empire, a condition of danger, attempt to shut up a voice or prevent it from being heard. Provided that the voice comports itself according to the laws of the land, so that it is not like a noxious vapour, pestilential and inevitably doing harm, that voice should be allowed to be heard; and, so far from its being dangerous to hear a voice, properly used, it is a safer and wiser thing to listen for the voice of all portions of the community which are entitled to be heard. The only necessity is that in that utterance there should be conformity with the general welfare of the community. But, subject to that, unquestionably it is wiser and safer to have the voice uttered; and, so far as I am concerned, were I in fact ranged on one side and labour on the other, I should in the interest of safety welcome a chance upon the part of labour to utter its voice. I consider that in respect of risk that is by far the better situation.

But, ladies and gentlemen, I am speaking, I hope, from a bigger and higher standpoint than that. I am honestly speaking as an individual, claiming not to voice the wishes or thoughts of any one but myself. I have allowed you to see something of the things which have been in my mind year after year, and I can only claim for myself—and this has reference, I think, to this gathering here—that in the days when I, like perhaps some of you, worked and felt that my work was not properly remunerated in respect of return in money, I was not very much concerned about that; but what think you, concerned me? It was this: that I knew that, no matter what might happen, I could always say that for every dollar I had received I had given at least the cents' worth of work. I suggest that there is a vast consolation in that, and I offer it to any who at any time may think they are individually not properly appreciated.

And now, as to the general well-being of the community, I do not suggest that labour and all other portions of the community be heard so as to give safety, either to interests in which I am interested or to any other interests, but only in order that true justice may be done, for I think that too much we are concerned as to the points of danger and safety, and I suggest rather that there ring through our minds for contemplation that noble word of Shakespeare:

> I dare do all that may become a man;
> Who dares do more is none.

Mr. JAMES H. ASHCROFT (Winnipeg): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to make a speech, but I wish to say a few words in regard to this matter. I, like the last speaker, have not made a study of Proportional Representation to any extent, but I have been impressed with the idea that in our Parliaments and in our Governments, both here and in the Old Country, it has been the minority that rules. Where that has not been the case, it has been a majority overwhelmingly large, and consequently not subject to a reasonable amount of criticism. I think, with the gentleman on the other side, that Labour should have proper representation; but that is not the only thought in my mind in this connection.

There are two other parties in this country. If Labour is going to be a distinct party by itself, and if we are going to have what is called a Conservative party and a Liberal party, it is not in the interest of the country that any of them should be overwhelmingly strong, or that the weaker party should be unreasonably weak. What we have proposed is that the Government should do what they have already undertaken to do, and what the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations has recommended, namely, look carefully into the matter of Proportional Representation.

In conclusion, I would simply say that in doing so there is one point that I trust they will watch carefully, and that is the dividing of the constituencies in a fair way and grouping them together so that there will be a fair representation; and I trust that they will take care that the franchise of this country is protected in the interest of our own people. We do not want aliens, people who have little knowledge of the country and its necessities, to have a vote before they have learned our conditions.

Mr. GUS FRANCQ (Montreal): I do not desire, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, to take very much of your time in dealing with this question. In rising to close this debate, Mr. Chairman, being neither an Irishman nor a Scotchman, I ask your permission to say a few words in the language of the country in which I was born. I shall now have the pleasure of addressing to you a few words in French.

Monsieur le Président, mesdames et messieurs, je crois qu'il est bon qu'un représentant de la classe ouvrière de langue française exprime son opinion sur la représentation proportionnelle. Comme je l'ai dit en anglais, étant né dans un pays où la représentation proportionnelle est en force depuis plus de vingt ans, et en ayant pu juger du résultat qu'elle a donné et des bienfaits qu'elle a créés en permettant aux différents groupes politiques de la Belgique d'être représentés suivant l'importance du vote qu'ils avaient obtenu; ayant de plus cherché, conjointement avec l'honorable F. D. Monk, et d'autres, à introduire cette réforme parlementaire au Canada, je crois pouvoir être l'interprète du désir de la classe ouvrière d'obtenir cette réforme.

Si l'on considère les résultats suivant cette réforme dans les élections parlementaires de 1908 en Belgique, où les conservateurs obtenaient 515,926 votes, les libéraux et socialistes 633,258, et les démocrates chrétiens 16,095, leur donnant respectivement 37 sièges, 43 sièges et 1 siège, l'on doit être convaincu de l'excellence d'un système qui permet à un parti, n'ayant obtenu que 16,000 votes sur un nombre total de plus d'un million de votes, d'avoir sa représentation dans la chambre. Quelle n'aurait pas été la représentation des différents groupements politiques du Canada si l'on avait appliqué le même système lors des dernières élections fédérales? La classe ouvrière ne se trouve actuellement représentée au parlement fédéral que par deux de ses membres. Les partis politiques ont remporté d'une manière presque unanime les différentes provinces, qui se sont groupées géographiquement vers l'un ou l'autre des deux grands partis politiques. Si l'on désire établir l'harmonie entre le capital et le travail, si l'on désire obtenir des relations cordiales entre les différentes races qui peuplent le Canada, l'on doit trouver moyen de leur permettre d'exprimer leurs opinions par une représentation juste et adéquate. Je suis convaincu que les délégués siégeant actuellement des deux côtés de cette conférence sont maintenant convertis au système de la représentation proportionnelle, grâce à l'éloquent plaidoyer présenté par sir John Willison et Monsieur Woodward. Je crois qu'ils partiront d'ici des apôtres fervents de cette réforme politique et qu'ils en deviendront des propagateurs zélés; et d'ici longtemps plusieurs d'entre nous pourront se rencontrer dans la Chambre des communes pour y représenter, grâce à la représentation proportionnelle, les deux éléments qui doivent travailler au bien et à la prospérité de ce pays—le capital et le travail.

Dr. D. STRACHAN: I have been asked by some of the gentlemen to make a reply to the very delightful address which the gentleman has made in his own language, and I wish to reciprocate and say, "Oui, oui."

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion for the adoption of the report of the committee. Are you ready for the question?

The motion was put and carried unanimously.

JOINT INDUSTRIAL COUNCILS.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE FAVOURING THEM—ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. FRED. WELSH (Vancouver): Mr. Chairman, I beg to submit the report of the committee which was appointed to deal with this subject, which is as follows:

Your Committee is of the opinion that there is urgent necessity for greater co-operation between employer and employee. We believe that this co-operation can be furthered by the establishment of Joint Industrial Councils. Your Committee does not believe it is wise or expedient to recommend any set plan for such Councils.

We therefore recommend that a Bureau should be established by the Department of Labour of the Federal Government to gather data and furnish information whenever requested by employers and employees or organizations of employers or employees that whenever it is desired to voluntarily establish such councils

the fullest assistance should be given by the Bureau.

F. W. Welsh,	Wm. Mackechnie,
D. A. Carey,	F. J. Gerhardt,
Omer Fleury,	F. P. Jones,
D. Strachan.	David Carnegie.

I have great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in moving the adoption of this report. In so doing, I should like to state that, while possibly neither of us have got everything that we desired, yet we have attempted in that spirit of co-operation which has been so manifest throughout the Conference to reach a decision that can be accepted by both sides, feeling sure that we have done our best to safeguard both employers and employees, and also that large proportion of the community represented by the Third Group.

Mr. F. P. JONES (Montreal): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion made by my friend on the other side. I also have great faith and belief that these councils and this get-together spirit of the workers on both sides of industry will result not only in bettering the condition of the workers and of the industries, but to the benefit of the country as a whole.

Hon. Senator Robertson resumed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: For the information of the Department of Labour, might I ask just what is the committee's interpretation of the second clause of this report? It reads:

> We therefore recommend that a Bureau should be established by the Department of Labour of the Federal Government to gather data and furnish information whenever requested by employers and employees or organizations of employers or employees that whenever it is desired to voluntarily establish such Councils the fullest assistance should be given by the Bureau.

Is the department to understand that the Bureau is to be established only upon request, or that it should be established to gather data which will be available at all times?

Mr. FRED WELSH (Vancouver): It was the intention of the Committee that it should be established in connection with the Department of Labour, as we feel that that department has its hand on the pulse of the movement generally in Canada. We also thought it possible, owing to the great expanse of our country, that it might be necessary, when the information had been compiled, to have representatives similar to those of the Labour Gazette, so that the data could be forwarded and furnished to any person in any locality who might desire it.

The CHAIRMAN: Thank you. You have heard the report of the Committee and the motion of Mr. Welsh, seconded by Mr. Jones. Are you ready for the question?

The motion was put and carried unanimously.

Mr. A. MONRO GREER: I am going to make a motion which on its face may suggest a wish to waste time. I am in fact making the motion with a very sincere desire to have good use made of the time. In my experience of our proceedings here, while some of us have had the pleasant task of speaking, in this room—which is not a matter of hardship, but simply out of pleasant occupation so far as the speaker is concerned, no matter how fruitful from the standpoint of the hearer—yet outside of this room there is very real work done. To my mind the work of attending to these resolutions and putting them in shape not only requires time, but calls for the very best application of the mind of each one devoted to the subject in hand; and individually I find it extremely hard to divide myself up mentally, with any sort of satisfaction to myself, or with reference to the work in hand. Therefore I make the motion that we rise now until the usual hour of meeting after the mid-day meal, with a strong injunction from the Chair to us all, if you will, that as much as possible of the intervening time be seriously and zealously spent by each and all of the committees in accomplish the end desired, namely, to bring in a report from each committee that has a matter in hand.

The motion was seconded by Mr. J. A. McClelland, and carried.

The Conference adjourned at 11.45 a.m. to meet at 2.30 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Conference resumed at 2.30 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair understands that there will be some committees ready to report in about five minutes time.

THANKSGIVING DAY AND ARMISTICE DAY.

PROPOSAL FOR JOINT DOMINION HOLIDAY.

Mr. R. A. RIGG: Mr. Chairman, in the interval, while we are awaiting something else, I have had my attention called to a Bill which has been introduced into the

House of Commons this morning, I think for the purpose of making the second Monday in November a Dominion holiday to observe jointly Thanksgiving Day and Armistice Day, and the member who introduced the Bill, Mr. Pedlow, I believe, is desirous of ascertaining the opinion of this Conference as to whether such a statute is desirable.

I think that from the point of view of the representatives of the employees there will not be the slightest objection to that, and I do not believe there will be any from the other side of the House. I beg leave, Sir, to move that this Conference express its opinion in favour of such statutory action being taken.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER: Mr. Chairman, in the absence of Mr. Shaw and the other members on this side I claim this indulgence, that this particular matter be allowed to stand for a while, because, no matter how strongly my own individual judgment might run, I should certainly feel differently about venturing to speak on their behalf, when I have not the slightest idea of what their views are.

I should like to explain my standpoint in making these remarks. Whilst I made that observation not knowing the views of all of those on this side, I do not like to let a moment elapse before stating most explicitly that on general grounds we like extremely the notion of this combination of the two events in the commemoration. However, to be quite practical in the matter, while I am not sure that we all consider that particular date as a good one, or that some may not be of the opinion that it is somewhat late in the year, as to the general suggestion there is, of course, no question and no room for argument.

Mr. G. R. DEACON: Make it Sunday.

The CHAIRMAN: The proposal, I understand, was to set aside the second Monday of November in each year both for the observance of Thanksgiving Day and in commemoration of the Armistice.

Mr. RIGG: Yes, jointly.

The CHAIRMAN: And that the member introducing the Bill in the House of Commons desired an expression of opinion from this Conference on the subject.

Mr. RIGG: Yes

The CHAIRMAN: Any person who desires to express an opinion is perfectly free to do so.

Mr. S. R. PARSONS: Mr. Chairman, I believe that we are all ready to approve of the suggestion that in some way we should commemorate Armistice Day, and I believe further that the second Monday in November is a far better day for Thanksgiving Day than the earlier date on which we have celebrated it in past years. I think also that the fact has been made clear that Monday is, in our estimation, a preferable day, for it seems to suit all of us workers better than any day in the middle of the week. We used to have Thanksgiving on Thursday, and I suppose the United States still have it on that day; but we have come to believe, those of us who work so hard, that it is better to have two days of rest coming together. The difficulty, it seems to me, when we set apart the second Monday in the month is that we get away from the real date on which we should celebrate the signing of the armistice. Just as it is a little awkward to celebrate a boy's birthday two or three days before or after, so, it seems to me, when in trying to signalize any special even in our history we fix a day which is either earlier or later than the anniversary, we lose the real significance of it. Therein and therein only lies the difficulty, it seems to me, in connection with this proposition. Altogether, I certainly am in favour of the suggestion which has been made and which, I understand, has been embodied in a Bill before the House of Commons.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other delegates desiring to express an opinion on the subject?—Then the secretary will kindly communicate to Mr. Pedlow, M.P., the message that the subject-matter of his Bill was discussed by this Convention and that all the opinions expressed were favourable to its adoption.

UNEMPLOYMENT, SICKNESS AND OLD AGE INSURANCE.

REPORT OF COMMTTEE FAVOURING BOARD OF INQUIRY—WIDOWS' PENSIONS INCLUDED—ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

The CHAIRMAN: We will now receive the report of Committee No. 6, on Insurance against Unemployment, Sickness, Invalidity, and Old Age.

The Secretary read the report, as follows:

Report of Committee No. 6 on State Insurance against Unemployment, Sickness, Invalidity and Old Age.

This Committee unanimously endorses the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations that a Board or Boards be appointed to enquire into the Subjects of State Insurance against Unemployment, Sickness, Invalidity and Old Age.

For the effective carrying out of the above this Committee recommends:

1st. That such Board or Boards shall be representative of the interests participating in this Conference, viz., the Government, the public, the employer and the employee, and shall include a representative of the women of Canada.

2nd. That in order to collect necessary data, the Government shall forthwith attach to the proper branches of the labour or other departments concerned experienced investigators, who shall do the necessary research work and furnish to the Board at the earliest opportunity the results of their investigations.

3rd. That the Government shall set a time limit for the receipt of the report and recommendations as to the advisability of enacting legislation.

4th. While this Committee has been appointed to consider only the questions of State Insurance against Unemployment, Sickness, Invalidity and Old Age, it respectfully recommends that the subject of "widows' pensions" be added.

W. R. Bello.
Henry Bertram.
W. E. Segsworth.
Kathleen Derry.
J. S. McLean.
R. C. McCutcheon.
F. H. Whitton.
G. Frank Beer.

Mr. JAMES SIMPSON (Toronto): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: It was the arrangement of this Committee that Mr. Whitton, the Chairman, should move the adoption of the Committee's report; but Mr. Whitton is not present yet, and, as I was to present the case on behalf of the labour men at this Conference, it is now arranged that I shall proceed at once with the presentation of the case, and when Mr. Whitton comes he can fulfil his promise and obligations to the Committee.

The subject of state insurance against unemployment, old age, invalidity and sickness is one of the subjects upon the agenda which give to every delegate representing any of the four groups in his Convention a real opportunity to put "brother" back into "brotherhood". It is not one of those contentious questions which divide a house where employers and employees are vitally concerned, but it is a subject which arises from conditions resulting from our present social and economic order, and up to the present time the activities of men in religious, benevolent and fraternal organizations have been directed to the amelioration of such conditions. Consequently every delegate is interested in the subject of state insurance to protect those citizens who are included in the groups which are mentioned in that recommendation.

The Royal Commission, whose report we are now considering, has made a definite recommendation that boards of experts should be appointed to take into careful consideration such evidence or information as might come before them bearing upon the advisability of this state insurance. In support of the recommendation the Commission have submitted to this gathering a part of the evidence which was adduced when they were making their tour, and which went to show that unemployment, sickness and old age had something to do with the conditions in this country which it was sought to remove by this investigation and such action as this Conference is now taking, and they expressed themselves in these words:

11. Unemployment may arise from other causes than the loss of his job. He may be incapacitated by sickness, invalidity or old age. Very few labourers are able, out of their earnings, to make provision for these contingencies. We recommend to your Government the question of making some provision by a system of State Social Insurance for those who through no fault of their own are unable to work, whether the inability arises from lack of opportunity, sickness, invalidity, or old age. Such insurance would remove the source of fear which now haunts the wage earner and make him a more contented and better citizen.

We represent organized labour particularly and unorganized labour indirectly, because, after all, the aspirations and the hopes and the desires of the unorganized working men and working women of this nation are the same as the aspirations and the hopes and the desires of the men who constitute organized labour. Therefore organized labour, in assuming the responsibilities which it has assumed, has regarded it as a duty not only to determine the rates of wages and the hours of labour and the conditions which should obtain in our industries, but also to manifest that real spirit of brotherhood which we claim is characteristic of the labour organizations of this and every other country. In the manifestation of that spirit, Mr. Chairman, we have developed within labour organizations departments for old age pensions, departments for sick benefits, departments for the care of the dependents of those who have gone, and we have in various other activities within our organization manifested a desire not only to improve the economic and social standard of the working men and working women, but also, tending the accomplishment of our purpose, to seek at least to make brighter the lives of those who feel that economic pressure is bearing too heavily upon them.

In this connection it may be of interest to you to know that of the 114 international labour organizations upon this continent 74 have reported to the Department of Labour of this country, showing to what extent they were devoting their energies to the assistance of their members along the lines which I have indicated. While death benefits do not enter into the subject which we are discussing, it will not be out of place for me to say that these 74 labour organizations last year—in one year alone—paid out $12,679,000 in death benefits.

Unemployment has also been the subject of serious consideration by at least thirteen of our great international organizations. Unemployment benefits and travelling benefits are a part of their benevolent work. Those thirteen organizations in one year spent over $91,000 in that kind of relief.

For the relief of those suffering in sickness and from accidents the international organizations have paid out over one million and a quarter dollars.

Although we have only two international organizations to-day who have organized old age pension funds, these two international organizations—the International Bricklayers', Masons' and Plasterers' Union, and the International Typographical Union—paid out last year over three-quarters of a million dollars in old age pensions; and it is characteristic of the International Typographical Union that, in the creation of their old age pension fund and the payment of the benefits derived from that special consideration is given to the weaker members. "The strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak and not to please themselves"—I think that is quite scriptural, Mr. Grier. Therefore, the men who have the highest wages and who pay their contributions to this fund upon those higher wages, when it comes to benefits to be derived from the fund, receive no more than those who pay upon earnings which are, perhaps, half as much as those of the more highly paid men in the printing trades upon the North American continent. Thus the highly paid men contribute to the old age pension funds more than those who do not make nearly as high wages and could not pay as much.

I mention these facts merely to show you that in one year alone, in the various benevolences these organizations paid out over $16,000,000 to members. My purpose in mentioning this is to submit to you that we are justified, inasmuch as we have endeavoured to set a worthy example, in dealing with this question of state insurance. Consequently the labour men feel that among the obligations that rest upon our Government one of the most important is to make a careful and searching investigation of the conditions obtaining which might render necessary the development of these national or state insurance schemes in the Dominion of Canada. I think it can be safely said that up to the present time we have not been leaders in the scheme of state insurance; that although a considerable amount of work has been done, and appeals have been made to Provincial and Federal Governments for state funds, either to establish mothers' or widows' pensions, or to establish health insurance, or to develop other phases of this state insurance plan, we have been only partially successful in having such laws placed upon our statute-books.

Careful study of the development of state insurance as applied to these four or five branches will show the wisdom of the course recommended by the Royal Commission: that, first of all, the whole plan of state insurance should be fairly investigated by experts, and that as a result of the investigation there should be distinct and definite recommendations made to our various Parliaments covering such questions as are within their jurisdiction, and bearing upon the subject of state insurance.

Speaking of unemployment insurance, I remember the time, ladies and gentlemen, when in the Old Country particularly it was considered almost a civil offence for a working man to be unemployed, or at least, if he was observed while not engaged in useful labour, he was classified as an idler and loafer, and the stigma of that name was placed upon him. It had not been considered whether he was a victim of conditions, or whether his condition at that time was only an evidence of his incapacities or weaknesses. But organized labour has insisted that a man's unemployment might not necessarily be through any fault of his own, that it might arise out of an industrial or economic order which did not provide steady employment for workingmen or for working women, and that, inasmuch as we, as citizens, or Governments themselves, were responsible for the condition which made unemployment a part of our civilization, then that person who was unemployed should not be held responsible, and some effort should be made to make life brighter for him during the time of his unemployment, not forgetting that every effort

should be made to provide him with the employment that he sought but did not get. It was the recognition of the responsibility of the State that led to the establishment of unemployment insurance; and because of the establishment of unemployment insurance in one country the subject was considered by other countries. The system of unemployment insurance has been a gradual development, improving as it has gone along, so that to-day the great industrial conference which has been meeting in England, in its report published in the London Times, states that not only should the unemployment insurance which obtains in Great Britain be continued, but that the payments should be increased and that the insurance should be extended to workingmen who have only part-time employment. Another recognition of the fact that part-time employment may not be the responsibility of either the employer or the employee, but is a result of the existing economic and commercial system is that system which seeks to assist the trades unions in their efforts to relieve employment, and which recognizes that some assistance should be given to the unemployed. That is the way in which the problem has been met by European countries, originating, as it did in Belgium.

This committee is not asking this Conference to endorse any particular plan. It is only asking that the most careful investigation be made into the subject, as a result of the findings of the board whose inquiries resulted from the data collected by the experts of the Labour Department. We are only asking that if, after that investigation has been conducted, it is found to be necessary, this country should not lag behind in providing unemployment insurance.

In the summer of 1918 the percentage of unemployed among unorganized labour was one-half of one per cent. This summer, at a time when it was expected that as many men as could be obtained would be employed, it was 2¼ per cent. So you see there was a substantial increase in the number of unemployed from the summer of 1918 to the summer of 1919. The unemployed problem becomes an acute one in the Dominion of Canada, as it becomes acute in any other country. Those who have had the experience of passing through such periods in such cities as Toronto and Montreal will know that. Some of you will remember our registration in the city of Toronto in 1914, which showed over 18,000 unemployed.

In advocating unemployment insurance, I am satisfied that those who represent labour will endorse the position I take when I say that while we approve of unemployment insurance as a principle, as a legislative necessity, we also believe that every possible means should be taken by the Government, and by every one concerned, to see that the fullest amount of employment is provided, so that unemployment insurance may be reduced to a minimum. We also recognize that there are new features to unemployment insurance which are worthy of consideration. We believe that it would be preferable to keep men partly employed, instead of having them wholly unemployed, which necessitates paying them the full amount of unemployment insurance during the time of their unemployment. Part-time employment might be given in industries which otherwise would lay off a large proportion of their men; and out of the unemployment insurance fund there should be a subsidy or a grant given to those men working only part time to bring their incomes up to a standard, perhaps allowing them to bear a part of the loss. No representative of labour desires that workingmen should be unemployed when there is any opportunity for labour under proper conditions, because we recognize that work is one of the essential things of life, and that every man should do a fair proportion and contribute his part to the sum-total of production. We realize that if anything will cause a man to deteriorate, it is having too much leisure time—if you want to put it that way—too little to do.

It has been emphasized in this Conference a great many times that there are unemployed not only amongst the workers but amongst the capitalists of this country, and of every other country, and it is just as bad for a capitalist to have nothing to do as it is for a workingman. The only difference is that the capitalist may have greater means of occupying and enjoying the time that he is spending in unemployment. We contend that unemployment is not conducive to the development of the individual.

Unemployment insurance in other countries has proved a success. Mr. McAdoo, Director General of Railroads in the United States, recently said:

> Insurance against sickness, old age, and unemployment, as they have it in England and other European countries, may be the next social step for the United States.

The labour movement of New York State has also had under consideration the question of state insurance. In all the programmes there is sickness insurance. Some

doubt has been expressed as to the necessity of insurance for the sick. In the opinion of others it is held that health insurance, or insurance for the sick, is even more necessary than unemployment insurance. The New York State Federation of Labour in their report make this observation:

> In England such considerations led the Government to strengthen the British Health Insurance Act even during war-time. Senator Colby, Chairman of the New Jersey Commission, who recently returned to this country after making a study of the British system said:
>
> "Compulsory health insurance in Great Britain is an emphatic and recognized success. The war has not hampered, but has strengthened the operation and good results of the law. In some cases the rates of sickness compensation have been raised. From every point of view the relief has been beneficial and successful. The system which was established in 1911, and expanded by further legislation down to 1916, is firmly established upon the solid ground of achievement."

Mr. Charles Duncan, Secretary of the Workers' Union of Great Britain, who represented the Barrow constituency in the British House of Commons for a number of years, commenting upon the matter when some doubting American suggested repealing the British Health Insurance Act, replied:

> Repeal the Health Insurance Act? England is not wasting time discussing absurdities. To repeal the Health Insurance Act would cause a social revolution in England to-morrow.

From the opinion of Mr. McAdoo as to what would happen in the United States, and the opinion of Mr. Duncan as to the success of health insurance in the old country, it would appear that what has been done up to the present is meeting with the approval of at least some of the men who are keenly interested in state insurance.

I just want to make this passing observation in supplementing what I have already said. There never was a time in our own country when there was so much attention paid to health insurance. Medical health officers are dealing with the subject as they never did before, and, from their statements as they appear in the press and elsewhere, we can only gather this fact, that they are almost unanimous in agreeing that some steps should be taken along the lines of health insurance. The necessity for health insurance was recognized by Governments thirty years ago, and the principle adopted by one Government has been recognized by other Governments, particularly in Europe, until it has become a question of almost universal attention.

I do not need to present to this Conference the historical development of sickness insurance in the different countries in the world. Those who have gone carefully into the question of the prevalence of sickness in the various states have shown conclusively that there is no time during any year when there are not thousands of persons who are either seriously ill or suffering from minor ailments, which withdraw men and women from industries and inflict in many cases hardship upon those who are toiling.

An argument for old age pensions should not need very much elaboration in the Dominion of Canada, because there is nothing in this country that will exempt or excuse the people of Canada from a very careful consideration of the subject. I was particularly struck when I was in New Zealand a few months ago by the appreciation of the citizens of that country who were enjoying the benefits of the old age pensions established by the Government. It was delightful to see them around those great centres of activity, the general post offices, where the widows and aged men and women who are entitled to the pension go to receive their monthly cheques. You who have been in the Old Country in the past few years will have seen those posters, similar to what we have seen in this country dealing with old-age annuities, which show very clearly that it is much preferable to have old men and women, after they have reached the age of seventy—in New Zealand it is sixty-five for men, and sixty for women—enjoying an independent living free from the stigma of the workhouse which previously had been the only place to which they could go before the pension system was established. No man could look unmoved upon the picture of these poor people going to the workhouse, and then upon the other picture where they were saved the mortification, because society had evinced a desire to help them and had gone so far as to make the State responsible for old-age pensions.

Just a word as to invalidity. It is classed very much with old age, because the incapacities of old age are just as severe. Those who are invalids and who have no physical means of sustaining themselves should naturally be the care of the State.

The last question to which I shall refer is the necessity of pensions for widows. That has been added in our report, although not appearing on the agenda, the feeling being that it would be an oversight if it were not dealt with.

I am very glad to think that the Ontario Government are conducting an investigation

on this subject, and that our Premier has assured us that at the next session of the Legislature very careful consideration is going to be given to it, and that there is a probability that in a short time we may have in the province of Ontario a system of pensions for widows. Three of the Western Provinces—Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan—have already adopted a straight widow's pension, which, if not entirely free from contribution of any kind, is a contributory scheme of some kind. My reason for dwelling upon this phase of the subject is because I contend that the expenditure of money paid to widows who have to care for their children is not necessarily a gross expenditure. When widows go out to work some one has to take care of the children, and very often the children are left in the care of some State institution, and the cost of the care which they get must be regarded as a charge upon the public.

Even the monetary consideration, ladies and gentlemen, suggests that every little child that comes into this world who is deprived of the care of the father is entitled to the fullest love and affection of the mother, who should not be torn away from the children at the time when her assistance and love are so much required. Therefore legislation based upon that condition is but a fulfilment of the sentiment which has been expressed so frequently on that side of the House, of restoring the real spirit of brotherhood in our industrial and commercial relationships.

I feel happy in announcing that your committee, which is representative of both employers and employees, have reached an unanimous opinion on this subject. They have agreed to ask the Government to appoint a board to go into this question fully, such board to have associated with it experts connected with the Labour and other departments, to collaborate and to present information on which the board could base its recommendations. This report, coming into this general Conference unanimously from both employers and employees, is another evidence that both sides are desirous of doing something. It should be a matter of gratification that we can reach that unanimous conclusion.

There is not a citizen who is desirous of doing the very best in his life-time but wishes to make this world a better world when he goes out of it than it was when he came into it. Let me close with this picture of what I want to present to you. I see a world without a slave. Man at last is free. Nature has by science been unclaved; lightning and light, wind and wave, frost and flame, and all the secret, subtle powers of earth and air have become tireless toilers for the human race. I see a world of peace, adorned with every form of art, with music's myriad voice thrilled, and lips athrob with words of love and truth—a world in which no exile sighs, no prisoner mourns; where labour gets its full reward; where work and worth go hand in hand; and where the poor girl, trying to win her bread with the needle, is not driven to the desperate choice of crime or death of suicide or shame. I see a world without a beggar's outstretched palm, a miser's heartless, stony glare, the prisons walls of wood, the livid lips of lies, the cruel eyes of scorn. I see a race shapely and fair, married harmony of form and function; and as I look life lengthens, joy deepens, and love encircles the earth; and over all, in the high dome, shines the eternal star of human hope. I trust that that will be the condition to which we are moving.

Mr. F. H. WHITTON (Hamilton): Ladies and gentlemen, fellow-delegates: I have pleasure in presenting to you one of the unanimous resolutions of this Conference. You have all listened with great interest to the address by Mr. Simpson. The report itself calls for dealing with principles. Mr. Simpson has given you a large amount of information regarding what has taken place in other countries, which must be of great assistance to you all in coming to a decision as to whether you agree with the report as has been presented or not. It can hardly be a question of requiring conviction, because we are all interested in this matter, I do not think you need any extended remarks. So I leave the matter for this gathering to deal with.

I do not know that any remark is necessary except as to Clause 3 of the report. We have asked that the matter receive prompt attention, both in the appointment of investigators, the report of such investigators, and the prompt consideration by the board of the recommendations made to the Government. I beg to move the adoption of this report, seconded by Mr. Simpson.

Mr. W. E. SEGSWORTH (Ottawa): As representing the Third Group on this committee, I have a few words to say.

The committee was impressed with the idea that this should be a subject of investigation by the proper department of the

Government. Mr. Simpson has given you a great deal of information as to why old age pensions should be granted. There might be some argument on that line; but I think it goes without question that before anything is done by the Government a great deal of investigating work should be done and the matter should be looked into very carefully. We have heard a great deal of what has been done in England and in other countries. I have returned just recently from England, and I have no doubt in the world that a great many of these things are necessary in England; but whether they are necessary in Canada I am not sure, and I think we all ought to have more light. We Canadians like to be independent; we are not used to being subjects of charity; and, while I am sure it is not the intention of anybody to make insurance of this kind a charity, I think it is very desirable that if legislation is to be passed, it should be framed in such a way that its benefits will go to those who really need them and not to those who wrongly take advantage of the law. However, I am glad to say that the three parties represented on the committee were heartily unanimous in the report.

The CHAIRMAN: The Conference has heard the recommendations of Committee No. 6 as read by Mr. Whitton, and seconded by Mr. Simpson, recommending the adoption of this report. What is your pleasure?

The motion for the adoption of the report was carried unanimously.

MINIMUM WAGE LAWS.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE—EXTENSION OF LAWS AND FURTHER INVESTIGATION RECOMMENDED—REMUNERATION OF TEACHERS.

MISS HELEN GUTTERIDGE: Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to move the adoption of another unanimous report—that of Committee No. 3 on Minimum Wage. The report is as follows:

Whereas it is considered expedient that minimum rates of wage should be fixed throughout Canada for women and children, whether employed at a time rate or according to any other method of remuneration;

Whereas Minimum Wage Laws for women and children have been enacted in five and are now in operation in four of the provinces;

Therefore, be it resolved that this Industrial Conference recommend to the Governments of all those provinces, which have not adopted Minimum Wage Laws for Women and Children, the speedy investigation of the necessity for such laws, and, if so found, the enactment of such legislation.

It is further recommended that the various provinces throughout the Dominion adopt a uniform law and method of application, but that in all cases the minimum of wages for women and children is to be determined from time to time, due regard being given to local living conditions.

It is the opinion of this Conference that the Dominion Government should appoint a Royal Commission, composed equally of representatives of Labour, Employers, and the Public, to investigate wages to unskilled workers and issue a report.

Representation has been made to the Committee that the remuneration paid female school teachers in one of the larger provinces of the Dominion is so low as to discourage the employment of the talent necessary to the proper education of its citizens. Your Committee recommends that the various Provincial Governments be asked to investigate such conditions, in the respective provinces, to the end that the children of all provinces of the Dominion have equal educational opportunities.

James B. Thomson,
O. W. Waller,
F. Daniels,
for Employers' Group
Helena Gutteridge
E. W. A. O'Dell,
W. F. Bush,
for Employees' Group.
Thos. Cantley,
R. B. Maxwell,
For Third Group.

In moving the adoption of this report, Mr. Chairman, I would state that Mr. Trowern, of the Retail Merchants' Association appeared before the Committee and recorded his objection to the inclusion in any minimum wage legislation of part-time workers in the retail trade. The wish of Mr. Trowern was that it should be so recorded.

Your committee, in discussing the question of minimum wage for unskilled workers, felt that we were not in possession of sufficient information to bring in a recommendation for enactment at once without investigation and a report being made of such investigation into the wages paid to workers of the whole Dominion. We felt that the matter should be taken up and legislation then made on the question, if necessary. I move the adoption of the report.

Mr. F. G. DANIELS (Montreal): In seconding the motion for the adoption of this report, I find myself in the position, first, of being on the committee appointed to consider it, and, second, as being the executive head of that infamous corporation that was attacked by the mover of the resolution of a couple of days ago, with a statement to the effect that it had walked away with the slight profit of 312 per cent.

In discussing this question of minimum wage for women and children, I found

amongst the employers a readiness of co-operation, so that our deliberations on that point required no great amount of time. The main point that it was considered necessary to secure was the method of application with a view to safeguarding the employee and the employer. In several of the provinces where a Minimum Wage Act has been adopted, industries have been grouped and the minimum wage applied to those groups. It was the general opinion that that was not the proper method; that locality and environment had much to do with the basis on which an award should be considered, otherwise industry would be continuously drawn to large centres, which would be something to be deplored; and that industries in small centres where living conditions were much better should receive due consideration. That was our object in referring to that particular clause.

With regard to the minimum wage for unskilled workers, it was thought that we had not the necessary data before us to determine the necessity for such a law, and consequently we decided to recommend that investigation should be made.

Noting the request from a representative who appeared before the committee in regard to the wages or so-called salaries of some of the female teachers, the committee had no hesitation in deciding upon such a clause. From my own experience throughout one of the provinces at least, I have found it to be a fact that the salaries paid in many of the smaller districts are absolutely inadequate and could not possibly maintain a person properly; and we feel that, for this reason at least, some consideration should be given to this particular clause. If the children of this country do not receive a proper education, the entire industrial fabric is going to be destroyed. There is a crying need throughout all industries to-day for better education amongst the employees. I therefore, Mr. Chairman, have very great pleasure in seconding the recommendation regarding a minimum wage for women and children.

The CHAIRMAN: Has any other delegate any observation to make upon this committee's report? You have heard the report of committee No. 3 on the question of a minimum wage.

Mr. DANIELS: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman. We omitted to state that, the second member of the Third Group being absent this afternoon, the report has not been signed by him.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a note to that effect on the original copy, which I hold—that Mr. Maxwell, one of the members of the Third Group, was not present to sign.

The motion was carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems difficult to have a difference of opinion here at all. Is any other committee ready to report?

Hon. Mr. Robertson here left the Chair, his place being taken by Sir John Willison.

LAND SPECULATION AND HOUSING.

RESOLUTION FAVOURING FURTHER INVESTIGATION.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir John Willison): Mr. G. B. Fraser, from the General Committee, has a resolution.

Mr. G. B. FRASER: I have pleasure in moving the following resolution:

Resolved, that this Conference, recognizing that much industrial unrest, economic loss and social suffering has resulted from bad accommodation, poor and insufficient housing, and high rents, heartily commends the action of the Dominion and Provincial Governments in their united efforts to improve housing conditions and to provide facilities for the proper and satisfactory housing of our people and recommends increased co-operation of, and investigation by, the Dominion and Provincial Governments to find a satisfactory solution of the problem.

Mr. JOHN A. FLETT (Hamilton): Mr. Chairman, I have just had handed to me a copy of the resolution moved by our friend Mr. Fraser on the other side, and I am quite in accord with the sentiments expressed therein. I hope the time will never come in this country when we will have a condition of affairs such as prevails in parts of Scotland, I presume where our friend Fraser originally came from. I understand that the conditions prevailing in that country, particularly with regard to the housing of the workpeople, is most deplorable. With so much available land, with natural opportunities at our doors, I think the time of this Conference could be very profitably spent in passing a resolution of this character, which could not possibly do harm, while the probabilities are that it might do good. Let us recommend this resolution. I do not think it is a controversial subject, and it seems to me we might all agree on it. Personally I am in perfect accord with the sentiments it expresses, and have much pleasure in seconding it.

Mr. E. PARNELL (Winnipeg): I am very pleased, indeed, to hear such a resolution brought in. We in the West have

had considerable difficulty in providing the necessary housing accommodation for many of our assistants, especially in Winnipeg. Believing, as I do, that the seeds of discontent and general unrest will germinate more quickly from the lack of proper housing accommodation than in any other way, I am absolutely in favour of the proposed resolution. In Winnipeg we have a very serious housing situation. In that city there are some 8,000 families who are living with two, three, and sometimes eight in a house. That is not a proper condition at all. I believe in putting through a resolution of this kind, as I am convinced that discontent can better be prevented in this way than any other.

I read in the paper to-day that Winnipeg has adopted a housing scheme, and proposes to spend a million dollars almost right away, borrowing the money from the provincial Government at five per cent, and it is proposed to lend that money to workpeople only, to be spent in providing housing accommodation; but our city government, realizing that it was impossible for men of small means to put down a large amount as a first payment on their houses, adopted the idea of asking the applicant to pay 15 per cent, which leaves 85 per cent of the total value to be advanced by the city, through a commission, to the applicant for the purpose of building a home. You can readily see that there is a great deal of difficulty and danger in giving so large an amount to the applicant; so they, in their wisdom, fearing that the scheme might revert to, and impose a hardship upon, the taxpayers of the city, asked the business men of Winnipeg to get behind it to the extent of another 10 per cent, which would be invested in the sinking fund of the city of Winnipeg and which would be a buffer preventing loss by the city to that extent. I want to say to you that, taking a very keen interest in this matter, we have been able to form a small company for the purpose of providing that $100,000, and before I left we were able to get from the business men, from less than twenty citizens, $65,000 of the amount. That money may be lost entirely; but whether it is or not, I consider that it is an investment which any one who can afford to put up the money will never regret because in making that investment we are elevating the status of the common people.

I believe the business men of this country as represented here at this Convention are keenly alive to the interests of the workpeople of Canada. It has been shown here that there is a reasonable spirit of co-operation and good-will and good feeling, and I believe a new era is coming in this country in the relations of capital and labour. Hoping and believing that that will be the result, I wanted to throw a little light upon conditions in the West and how we are handling them. I am heartily in accord with the resolution and I hope that every municipality in this country will deal with the situation and provide our workpeople with homes that will make them happier, more contented and prosperous, and give them something in which they will have a stake.

Mr. E. S. WOODWARD: Before speaking to the motion, may I say that the secretary of the Proportional Representation Society has given me some literature which he thought might be of interest to members here. There are about ten batches to be distributed amongst those who want this literature.

I just want to say in regard to this motion that I shall vote neither for nor against it. Until it is determined to what extent this money of which our friend has been speaking, intended for use in providing housing accommodation, is to go to pay the speculative value of land, which is condemned in the resolution, I could not express an opinion. But I do know that much of the money which is being granted by fairly liberal Governments, and is designed to benefit returned soldiers, is being used to acqiure land, and land has boomed in price and is going, not to the soldiers it is intended to benefit, but to those who are simply holding it for speculative pruposes. Therefore, until such time as that point is determined I could not vote either for or against the motion.

Mr. PARNELL: Will you permit me, Mr. Chairman, to reply to that just for a moment? A commission has been appointed in the city of Winnipeg—and I may say that we have on that Commission men who understand land values—to guide and direct the applicant in the purchase of his land, to see that he gets that land at a fair price, at a price he is able to pay. I quite agree with my friend that the time is coming when land values in this country will drop, so that the workpeople can own their homes. We have had too much speculation in this country. With the land that we have throughout our cities, there should be no difficulty in providing a home for

everybody. This Commission will undertake to see that that is done.

The CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, I think that this proceeding is somewhat irregular. All that the convention can do under the regulations is to refer this motion to the Miscellaneous Committee. Are you in favour of referring it to the Miscellaneous Committee?

The resolution was accordingly referred to the Committee.

FREE COMPULSORY EDUCATION.

RESOLUTION FAVOURING BETTER PROVISION IN ALL GRADES.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that Committee No. 9 is ready to report.

Major M. A. McINNES (Saskatoon): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, in rising to speak for the first time, I wish to thank the Chairman of this Conference for the privilege and honour of being here. I am an employee of the Government—a civil servant. I have always considered that the civil servant should be one of the best citizens in his community; that his work for his community should be such that his experience would be deserving of consideration in connection with other matters.

It is said that the pathway of life is dotted with memory's gravestones that mark the spots where noble enterprises perished for lack of good-will and physical development to embody them in deeds. Such cannot be said of the Chairman of this Conference. At the present time he is embodying his thoughts in deeds, and I feel safe in saying that in this Conference he has laid the foundation of a structure that shall give impetus to the future development of this Canada of ours for all time.

Now, Sir, I wish to say that there have come before the Committee various resolutions which the Committee must express their regret for having had to lay aside at this time, but they are of such a nature that they will find their place in the public mind in the future, and I have no doubt that the parties who have framed them will see that they take their proper place at the proper time.

However, we have unanimously decided on three resolutions which we are presenting to you. I wish to say, Sir, that while the members of this Conference as a whole has been throwing bouquets across from one side of the House to the other, we had in our committee a whole flower garden. The subject-matter of Item No. 8 of the agenda is:

> Consideration of any other proposals which may be introduced touching on the relations of employers and employees.

The first resolution is:

> Your Committee has considered and unanimously adopted the following resolutions:—
>
> 1. That this Conference endorses the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, as to the necessity of the extension of equal opportunities in education; and in view of bringing about this reform;
>
> That the Government of each province in Canada be asked to establish compulsory education for full time at least up to and including the fourteenth year, and for part time in cities and towns for the two succeeding years; and
>
> That, in all provinces, education in all grades should be made free, so that the child of the poorest paid worker be given the opportunity of reaching the highest educational institution.

I may say that I have before me these resolutions and I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, if it is the wish of this Conference that I read the three, or shall we deal with one at a time?

The CHAIRMAN: One at a time, I should think.

Mr. McINNES: Without taking up any more of your time, I have much pleasure in moving resolution No. 1 of our committee's report.

Mr. E. G. HENDERSON (Windsor, Ont.): I have much pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in seconding resolution No. 1, which has been introduced by our friend on the other side. I am sure all will agree that it is absolutely necessary that every one in this country should receive an education. The only time to teach a person is when he is young, and the period up to 14 years of age is, I think, not too long a time to compel any one to be kept at school. I have pleasure in seconding the adoption of that resolution.

Mayor BOUCHARD (St. Hyacinthe): Mr. Chairman, my first words will be to apologize for my English. I come from a French town and have never had much opportunity to learn English by conversation. As my father was a shoemaker, earning the magnificent salary of $9 a week as foreman of a shoe factory, I could not travel much and did not meet those whom I would have liked as much to meet; otherwise I might have acquired a better knowledge of English.

I deem it my duty as one of the representatives of the Union of Canadian Municipalities to say a few words on this question of education. During the Conference

we have been dealing with matters pertaining immediately to the material advantage of labour and capital, but I think that we should for a few moments direct our thoughts to the next generation. As I have been in public life, as alderman, mayor and member of the Legislative Assembly, for sixteen years, I have, perhaps, had an opportunity to learn the lessons that are taught to a man who is willing to do something to help his community, and what I have found is that we have been suffering from bad leadership, on the side of either labour or capital. There is only one way in which we can build up a sound leadership. I see here many of our labour leaders who are the kind we want in this country, but I think that the greatest trouble we have had in the West, and sometimes in the East, were due to the fact that the leaders on both sides had not the Canadian mentality. If we are to have leaders with the mentality that will bring peace and prosperity to this country, we must take them from the families of those who are living here, and if we are to have leaders from among the families of the labourers, we want those families to be educated—there is no question about that. When I speak of education I do not want to be understood as meaning only the ability to read and write. Education means something more than that, and if we desire to have the children of the labouring classes attain to the position of being good national labour leaders, we must give them the opportunity to acquire an education in all grades. There is only one way to attain that end: It is compulsory education.

I know that we have compulsory education practically everywhere in the country and that the different provincial governments are working to improve the present compulsory education laws. Compulsory education means that the State must necessarily provide free education, because there can be no compulsion where education is not free. Compulsory education is intimately related to the needs of the hour, and under that system we should give the children of the labourer the opportunity of obtaining the higher education, and they should not be debarred from it by poverty. The only means of providing it for them is by making free education in this country free in all grades. I am pleased to observe that the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations has recommended that, and I believe that when we have established free compulsory education in this country we may hope to see that unanimity of sentiment which we always find amongst educated people. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The resolution was agreed to.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND THE PRESS.

RESOLUTION ENDORSING VIEW OF ROYAL COMMISSION.

Major M. A. McINNES (Saskatoon) moved the second resolution as follows:

That we unanimously endorse paragraph 70 of the Report of the Royal Commission, as follows:

(70) The restrictions placed upon the freedom of speech and the liberty of the press, and the denial of the right to read such literature as any portion of the public demanded, was given as one of the principal causes of the present industrial unrest. We have no comment to make upon the policy of the Government in this respect. During the war it was necessary in the interests of the whole country and of the Empire that individual liberty should in many directions be restrained, but we believe that restrictions should not be imposed upon either the freedom of speech or the freedom of the press unless such restrictions are urgently demanded in the interest of the peace of the whole community. We recognize that no person has a right to do anything that is liable to incite the people to commit unlawful acts. A line must be drawn between liberty and license, but care must be taken to avoid creating the impression that the restraints imposed upon the freedom of speech or the liberty of the press, are intended to prevent criticism of legislative or governmental action.

I have much pleasure in moving this resolution.

Mr. E. G. HENDERSON (Windsor): Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution. As has already been explained, we simply adopted the wording of clause 2 of the report of the Royal Commission, as we did not think we were in a position to give any details as to what was seditious and what was not. We believe in free speech, but we do not believe in the circulation of seditious utterances or seditious documents.

Mr. R. THOMSON (Carleton Place, Ont.): Mr. Chairman, I rise to correct a misstatement that was made on the floor of this House the other day, a misstatement that was made owing to a headline which appeared in the press. With all respect to you, Sir, who have been connected with the press, perhaps more closely and for a longer period than any other gentleman in this House, may I at this time suggest the advisability of the press, even when they are attempting to sell their newspapers, being somewhat more accurate in the headlines which they publish and send broadcast through this country?

One of the delegates the other day, in referring to the question of percentage of profits, made a statement as to the profits obtained by a certain company from its operations of last year. A statement as to this matter first appeared in the press a few months ago, at the time of the investigation into the high cost of living in the House of Commons; and, as published, it was absolutely incorrect. It was said that this company had made a profit of 72 per cent—and between that time and the time when it was referred to on the floor of this House the other day, that profit had grown to 81 per cent.

I have no brief for this company; but, as was pointed out to the Commission on the High Cost of Living, the deduction made by the press was entirely wrong—and they, of course, admitted that it was wrong. I think I can recite the details of the case from memory, but if not, I guess I can dig them up out of my pocket. The statement was made that a certain concern had an investment of $600,000, and that they had made a profit of 72 per cent.

Mr. E. S. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I ask whether the gentleman is speaking to the subject before the House.

Mr. R. THOMSON: If I am not in order, I shall make myself in order at some other time. I presume I am in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir John Willison): I am bound to say that I think it would be better if Mr. Thomson would raise this question apart from the resolution.

Mr. R. THOMSON: You prefer to have it all over again. I propose to put it on record.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we had better take it separately from the resolution.

Mr. R. THOMSON: I defer to your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

With reference to the question before the House, I shall merely say, as the matter of the freedom of the press is before us, that it is distinctly up to the press to use better judgment, particularly in their headlines, and to promote harmony rather than inflame the public mind by statements of the kind I have mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN: If you will permit me, I should like to make myself understood. I think that Mr. Thomson should have a full opportunity to make his statement, and as soon as we have finished with the resolution before us, I shall ask him to do so.

Mr. L. BRAITHWAITE (Toronto): In my mind I couple this resolution with the first one. It seems to me that the two go very well together. In the first place, we need better education. In view of the fact that so much science has been introduced into industry I think there should be a sufficient surplus to give the children of the present generation a better education than was given to the children of the past generation. It has been said on the floor of this House that production is the basis of society; but I say education is the basis of society. I lay more emphasis on education than I do on production, particularly in view of the fact that during the war it was necessary to bring in men, professors in their different lines, to combine their knowledge with that of industry, in order to bring about greater production. Out of the knowledge of science combined with industry, we were able to produce a greater quantity than was ever before produced in our history. So in that respect there is very little difference between the first and the second of these resolutions.

Sedition has been referred to. I am quite in accord with those who say that some restriction should be exercised in such matters as that referred to by Mr. Thomson, just as we restrict individuals who have diseases that may affect the whole community, just as we have a censor to look after the picture shows that are shown to the general public.

I might say here, although I may be departing a little from the subject, that I think there should be a little more vigilance generally of the pictures that are shown to the young children of this country. It is all very well to put up a poster outside of a picture show and put a cloak of paint over a revolver or gun that may happen to be displayed; but why should we allow the children to go into that show and see the scene which is depicted on the poster outside of the door? Only recently I read of a certain crime being committed in Toronto by boys of fourteen years of age, and I am bound to say, here and now, that in my opinion of the character obtained in some of the pictures shown that prompts these young boys to commit such acts.

I do not think we should leave the matter of censorship to an autocracy. I believe in absolute democracy. In my opinion one individual is not enough to determine what is sedition and what is real edu-

cation. If there is to be a censorship I should like this Conference to go on record as being in favour of extending it. I think it would greatly assist in reducing the unrest pointed out in paragraph 70 of the report of the Royal Commission, because, anarchists—as we refer to them—are to be found not only among the class referred to in paragraph 70, but also in the ranks of capital, and among individuals who are supposed to be captains of industry.

Although I endorse the sentiment of the resolution, I should like to see it go a little further. I should like to see the status quo ante. But the committee does not seem to be unanimous on that point. I should like the Government to take into consideration the fact that this Conference was called to quiet in some measure the industrial unrest that exists in this country. I should like this Government to go on record as closing the book of the past, and, from the 15th of this month, when this Conference started its labours, opening up a new era of education and freedom of speech and of the press, which I think would be in the best interests of the country and its people.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER (Toronto): I do not rise to argue at all, Mr. Chairman, but merely to point out, in case any of us are in difficulty on this point, that the committee have, as they have told us, adopted verbatim the language of the report itself; and that whilst one does not in the slightest degree dispute the right of any member to express any view, yet it is on the language of the report that we are voting.

Mr. C. McCUTCHEON (Winnipeg): Mr. Chairman and delegates: the freedom of the press and of public assembly is a very keen question throughout Western Canada at the present time.

Some one has used the word "sedition", and a great deal depends upon the interpretation of that word. If it is a seditious act to get up and address a public meeting to which any and all are admitted, and to expound an economic theory—and it would appear from the actions of the Government in Western Canada that it was—then I am afraid that we in this Conference are not going to accomplish what we set out to do. If we are going to deny the right of the individual to get up in a public meeting and expound theories that are somewhat in conflict with the prevailing ones, then I am afraid we are not going to accomplish that which we set out to do.

I do not like to go into details, but on this occasion I feel that I must. I am personally acquainted with eight—shall we call them labour leaders? They are labour leaders purely by accident—who are now indicted for certain acts, and confined. While we were asked to be here, they were selected as the victims, for reasons best known to others.

So far as we are able to observe—and when I say "we" I mean many of those representing labour in Western Canada—and may I also include some of those from the East—those eight individuals under indictment for the crime of sedition, I think it is, have spent some twenty-eight days in jail, having been refused the consideration given to ordinary criminals. We cannot see that those individuals have committed any crime that we have not also committed; and many others connected with the labour movement of that section feel as we do. If those eight men are guilty of a crime, then we too are guilty of a crime. If we are innocent, then they too are innocent. This treatment of individuals, whose only crime as far as we can discern has been that of acting in the labour movement, is causing very much bitterness throughout that section of the country. They have on some occasions expounded doctrines that I shall refer to a little later; but we would ask, if we are going to bring about this industrial peace, as suggested by the previous speaker, that this sort of thing should be cleaned off the slate. If there ever was a cause for some of the restrictions that were imposed during the war, that cause has now been removed. If there ever was a cause for the restriction of free speech and free assembly during the war, that cause has now been removed. Let us start out by lifting this charge and releasing those who have been placed in confinement owing to conditions and circumstances arising out of the war, and I think that in that act we shall have gone a long way towards allaying the suspicion that is in the minds of many of the workers throughout Canada.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

RESOLUTION FAVOURING FURTHER GOVERNMENT PROVISION.

Major M. A. McINNES (Saskatoon) moved the third resolution, as follows:

(First) That in the opinion of this Conference adequate provision by public works or otherwise, should be made by the Federal, Provincial and Municipal Governments in connection with all interests represented at this Conference, to avert any serious unemployment

crisis which might occur during the ensuing eight months;

(Second) That the various interests represented at this Conference adhere strictly to the employment policy agreed upon by the Provincial Governments, which aims at the centralization of labour supply and demand in one agency.

(Third) That provision be made for immediate and continuous survey of available and prospective employment, and for adequate employment machinery to direct unemployed workers to employment available.

Mr. E. H. HENDERSON (Windsor): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion for the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. T. A. STEVENSON (Ottawa): In the interest of the workingmen of Canada I think a little emphasis should be laid on this resolution. About a year ago the Dominion Government enacted a law known as the Labour Co-ordination Act in which an agreement was made with the provincial governments, and since that time 90 government employment agencies have been established from the Atlantic to the Pacific. For a good many years labour men have recognized the curse to this country of private employment bureaus which charge one, two, or three dollars to workers for placing them with private concerns, and I think the establishment of these Government employment offices is one way of getting rid of that pernicious system. Our men have been returning from overseas, and the great responsibility of this country is to see that they are put into employment. I think we are entitled to the closest co-operation of the employers of Canada to make those Government employment offices what they should be, so that employers will seek assistance through them in all classes of labour.

The Minister of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment requested Major Anthes and myself to take hold of the Information Branch, which deals with the soldier in relation to employment; and since the establishment of that branch in January, through co-ordination with Government offices of this country, we have had 70,000 discharged soldiers apply for employment, and up to the present we have been successful in placing between 63,000 and 64,000 of those men in employment. I think that speaks fairly well for the industrial conditions of Canada through the present year.

We see by some of the official papers of the Veterans' organization that there is fear of considerable unemployment during the coming winter, especially among the discharged soldiers. Realizing at all times that the more skilled trades do not have the amount of difficulty in filling vacancies that some others do in this country, we are asking employers throughout Canada to patronize the Government employment offices wherever help is required, so as to see if we cannot establish a sufficient employment service throughout Canada. During the coming winter there will no doubt be what are known as problem cases throughout the Dominion of Canada, and these will have to be dealt with in the way of unemployment. These cases are those of men of peculiar disability; to look at them one might think they were physically fit, but they have been gassed, or have suffered in such a way in connection with the war that they are really problem cases. We realize also that a good many men with aspirations are back in this country, and such men are not absorbed into the industrial field as readily as they would be otherwise. I take this opportunity, therefore, of asking my good friends on the other side for their closest co-operation with the Government employment offices in dealing with these cases in order to absorb the discharged soldier as readily as possible into the industries of this country.

Mr. FRED. WELLS (Vancouver): Part of this resolution is one submitted by myself on behalf of the workers on the Pacific coast. We realize already that if a serious condition is not to prevail on the Pacific coast during the coming winter, steps must be taken by the Government to provide means of employment. We have a peculiar situation in the province of British Columbia. That province sent probably more men to the front, in comparison with our population, than any other section in Canada. Added to those who have returned, we have several thousands of soldiers from other parts of Canada who, having heard of the glorious climate of British Columbia, wished to take their discharge there.

The case I wish to bring before this Conference is one that was heard by a Royal Commission appointed by the Minister of Labour to inquire into the unrest in the shipyards of British Columbia. The report of that Commission may be found in last month's Labour Gazette. The Government of Canada, in their wisdom, decided in the fall of 1918 that all the shipyards in Canada were needed for the building of a Canadian merchant marine. The largest shipyard in British Columbia, the Coughlan yard, had offers from the French government of 20 vessels at the sum of $121 per dead weight ton. The Dominion government refused to

allow that firm to close those contracts, stating that they needed that yard until 1921 for building merchant marine. Since that date in 1918, four contracts have been awarded to the firm of Coughlan & Son, and the possibility is that that yard will be closed down in January unless more orders are placed by the Dominion Government. That remark applies to the two shipyards in Vancouver, the Coughlan and the Wallace yards, the closing of which will throw out of employment 4,000 men.

Just before leaving for this Conference, I was talking to a representative of the returned soldiers, and he informed me that at that time there were something like 3,000 men in the city of Vancouver who were registered as out of work. Add that to the number who will be thrown out if the shipbuilding industry is closed down, and you will recognize the absolute necessity for public works of some description, or a revision by the Dominion Government of their shipbuilding programme. As was shown by the evidence taken at that Royal Commission, the workmen were promised that the money invested in Victory loans would be returned to them in the way of wages in these shipbuilding yards. They subscribed to the Victory loans, but the contracts have not yet come through, and unless something is done there will be a serious situation in the city of Vancouver and the province of British Columbia. We are not asking the Dominion Government for anything but justice. When they refused to allow the firm to take contracts for ships that would have given three years work to the men in those yards, we feel that we are asking only what is right when we ask that they make good their pledge to the workers to return to them the money that was put into Victory loans. In advocating shipbuilding I am speaking of a useful investment, not a wasteful expenditure of money, because reports up to date issued by the Government show that the ships have been a good investment and are on a paying basis. If we must have money spent to relieve unemployment I think you will agree with me that it is a good thing to place it where it will make return for the money laid out in the interests of the people of Canada.

Mr. E. S. WOODWARD (Victoria): I just want to put on record my strong feeling that this unemployment problem should be dealt with by bringing into use the natural resources of this country. It seems to me to be an outrage that in a country with inexhaustible natural resources we should be even discussing the unemployment problem; but until we have some political party—I hope Mr. King will take the suggestion—with courage to recognize that God's natural bounty was intended for His creatures, we will always be talking on this unemployment problem.

Major McINNES: I would like to draw attention to the fact that this Committee is still sitting, and that we have other resolutions in addition to those that are being presented now; and if there are any other resolutions to be presented, I hope they will be sent to us at once.

The motion to adopt the resolution was then put and carried unanimously.

CORRECTIONS OF ALLEGED MIS-STATEMENTS.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir John Willison): Now I must ask Mr. Thomson to forget my ruling, and to make the statement he desired to make.

Mr. R. THOMSON (Carleton Place): I still think I was in order, in the sense that that we were discussing a matter in relation to the press, and I feel that the member who made the mis-statement should say that she gathered the statement from the press. It is a case where the press has made an unfair impression. The company is said to have made 81½ per cent; in the eastern papers it is said to be 72 per cent, but it got up to 81½ per cent when the report reached the West.

The truth, as has been stated already, is on record before the House of Commons Committee on the Cost of Living. The company during the fiscal year manufactured goods to the amount of $1,780,310. The gross profits earned were $437,833, of which amount the Government took $202,811 as excess profits. Therefore, if that comes off, the net profit, there is necessarily that much less left to the company. I have no brief for this company; it is not my company, nor is it one that I have any relationship with; but as it happens to be a textile company it is desirable that I should correct it. Deducting the war tax leaves a net profit of $235,022, or slightly over 13 per cent on the value of the goods manufactured. The paid-up capital stock of the company was $600,000, and the rest and reserve funds used as capital in the business amounted to $644,594, making the total shareholders' capital employed

in the business $1,244,504, and the net earnings of the company somewhat under 19 per cent. I have nothing more to say. These are the facts of the case, and I am sure you will accept this statement as being more nearly correct, because it is from the balance sheet, whereas the information you have received was gathered from an item issued by the press.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir John Willison): After the adjournment of the Conference I propose to go into private conference with Mr. Thomson, because I am not too certain that I was right; neither is he.

Mr. THOMSON: That is all right, you have nothing to apologize for.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: This morning I spoke to Mr. Hay about a remark that he made yesterday following my few remarks. He said:

> I would state that I have in my hand a paragraph in regard to this beautiful steel corporation that Mr. King elaborates so greatly upon.

Then he quoted the reference to the United States Steel Corporation, which is likely to be involved in a strike next week. I drew Mr. Hay's attention this morning to the fact that the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, the steel works there, had nothing whatever to do with the United States Steel Corporation, and I asked him if he would make the correction himself. He said that he would; but unfortunately he is not in the room, and I think it is desirable that this statement should be placed on the record just for the sake of accuracy.

Mr. C. McCUTCHEON (Winnipeg): On behalf of delegate Hay, I would say that he has been busy on a committee all afternoon, which accounts for the fact that he is not here.

Hon. Senator Robertson here resumed the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: I am informed that there is no other report ready, but there is a Committee working diligently and expecting to complete their labours this evening. I am perfectly willing to sit to-night if the Conference so desire.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER: Whilst apparently wasting time, I have a great desire to save time, and in that interest I move that we meet again to-morrow morning.

The motion was seconded in several places, and carried.

The Conference adjourned at 5.45 p.m. until to-morrow at 10.30 a.m.

CANADA

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

of Dominion and Provincial Governments with Representative Employers and Labour Men, at Ottawa, September, 1919.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

SIXTH DAY.

CONTENTS.

Letter from the Premier of New Brunswick.

Canadian Bankers' Association—Addresses by H. B. Mackenzie and J. P. Bell.

Vote of Thanks—To the Chairman, the Press, the Representatives of Provincial Governments, the Industrial Relations Commission, the Third Group, and the Secretary.

Hours of Labour and Labour Organizations—Announcement of Inability of Committees to report unanimously.
Addresses by John R. Shaw and R. A. Rigg.

Hours of Labour.

Report of Employers' Representatives—Investigation by Industrial Representative Commissions recommended.
Address by Melville P. White.

Report of Employees' Representatives—Legal Eight-hour Day Recommended.
Address by J. A. McClelland.

Report of Third Group—Laws based on Treaty of Peace and Industrial Commission Report Recommended.
Addresses by C. Lawrence, J. W. Bruce, S. R. Parsons, Tom Moore, J. R. Shaw.

Democratic Management of Government Work.

Report of Employers' Representatives—A Question Entirely for Governments and their Employees.
Address by Hugh Blain.

Report of Employees' Representatives—Favours Government Employees having Right of Appeal and Wages and Conditions equal to those of Private Employees.
Addresses by F. Grierson, J. E. Morash, J. C. O'Connor.

Report of Third Group—Favours Suggestions of Industrial Relations Commission.
Addresses by R. H. Grant, E. A. Wyndham, the Chairman, Tom Moore, Hugh Blain, T. A. Stevenson, A. Moore Coles.

The Civil Service—Statement by the Minister of Labour.

Organization of Labour:

Report of Employers' Representatives—Admit Right to Organize, but oppose Closed Shop and Indirect Negotiations.
Address by J. P. Anglin.

Report of Employees' Representatives—Recommends General Recognition of Right to Organize of Labour Unions, and of Collective Bargaining.
Addresses by W. L. Best, F. H. Ewart, Dr. D. Strachan, A. C. Hay.

The Housing Problem—Resolution Commending Government Action adopted unanimously.
Addresses by Major M. A. McKenzie, Hugh Blain.

Close of the Conference:
Addresses by J. H. Ashdown, T. A. Stevenson, Tom Moore, C. H. Cahan, Sir William Hearst, Hon. T. C. Norris, Hon. C. A. Dunning, the Chairman.

The Senate Chamber,

Ottawa, Saturday, September 20, 1919.

MORNING SESSION.

The Conference met at 10 a.m., Hon. Senator Gideon D. Robertson, Minister of Labour, presiding.

Mr. Gerald H. Brown acted as secretary.

The substitute delegates present were: Andrew A. McCallum for G. M. Bosworth;

E. Blake Robertson for J. R. Shaw; H. Macdonald for E. G. Henderson; F. Hawkins for J. Fraser McGregor; R. S. Cameron for G. R. Smith; all representing the employers.

The CHAIRMAN: May I ask that Chief Justice Mathers, the Chairman of the Commission, whose report we are considering, take a seat on the platform.

Hon. Chief Justice Mathers accepted the invitation.

LETTER FROM THE PREMIER OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

The SECRETARY read the following letter from the Hon. Mr. Foster, Prime Minister of the province of New Brunswick:

St. John, September 15, 1919.

Secretary to the
Industrial Conference,
c/o Department of Labour,
Ottawa.

I regret very much that circumstances which have arisen at the last moment have prevented me from attending the Industrial Conference at Ottawa which opened on this date. I fully intended being present to represent the government of this province. However, I am unable to be there. I write to ask that I be supplied with a report of the proceedings, which I presume will be published shortly after the close, with the object of enabling me to determine just what legislation it will be necessary for the government of this province to consider arising out of the various discussions and resolution which will probably be adopted. I fully realize the importance of the Conference and state that our government will be prepared to co-operate in the passing of any legislation that seems to be desirable in order that the various laws affecting the employment of labour will be as uniform throughout Canada as possible.

Yours truly
(Sgd.) W. E. Foster.

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

The CHAIRMAN: Is there any Committee ready to report this morning?

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW (Woodstock): I understand that Committees on Items 2 and 4 are still in session and will be ready to report very shortly.

CANADIAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION.

ADDRESSES BY REPRESENTATIVE DELEGATES.

The CHAIRMAN: In order that we may occupy the time profitably while waiting for the reports of those Committes, may I call the attention of the Conference to the fact that we have with us here during the whole week representatives of the Canadian Bankers' Association, who have expressed to me great interest in the proceedings of this Conference, but who have not felt inclined to take a prominent part in the discussions, for reasons which perhaps are obvious. I do think, however, that we might profitably hear from those gentlemen for a few minutes, if they would care to address the Conference, as to the impressions and opinions they have gathered as a result of their meeting with us. May I therefore ask Mr. Mackenzie, Assistant General Manager of the Bank of Montreal, to address the Conference briefly?

Mr. H. B. MACKENZIE (Montreal): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am very glad indeed to have the opportunity you have afforded me of saying a few words on behalf of this delegation from the Canadian Bankers' Association.

In the first place, Sir, I would like to express the thanks of this Association to yourself for the courtsey extended to us of being represented here. Bankers have no partizan allegiance to any one class of the community or any one section of the country. Our interests and our services extend to all classes, to all sections. Moreover, we have no first-hand knowledge of the particular problems that this Conference was called together to discuss. Of course, we know something of them, because we read the newspapers and we are endowed with the gifts of speech and hearing; but it so happens that they have never presented themselves to us in the guise of domestic problems; therefore we felt doubtful whether we could intervene helpfully in discussions looking towards their friendly settlement. So we considered it best that we should come here as listeners only. Though we are deeply interested in the questions under discussion and we share the hope that is common to both sides that the deliberations of this Conference may be fruitful of much permanent good. We are very glad, however, not to leave the Conference without having had an opportunity of expressing to you all the very deep interest with which we have followed the proceedings, our admiration of the excellent spirit in which they have been conducted.

Sir, if you will permit a personal reference, to which I am sure every one in this room will agree, I would like to pay a tribute of respect to the tactful impartiality of the Chair, which has contributed so much to the success of this Conference.

DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I would like to assure you that I am not speaking empty compli-

ments, because it means a great deal to all classes of the country, including the bankers, that you should on both sides of the House agree together. One of the very foundation stones of banking credit is confidence, and confidence is very rudely shaken by industrial unrest and class antagonism. With these things cleared away, our path is very much more clear to lend the necessary support to the commercial and manufacturing interests of the country.

The upheaval and dislocation caused by the war have been so tremendous and so widespread that we cannot expect the return to normal condition to be accomplished without friction; and this clearing and readjustment may indeed prove to be as severe a test as the war itself of our business prudence and ability, and of the quality of our citizenship. The war is going to leave us with a national debt of quite formidable proportions, and the interest on that debt, and the pensions, and the gradual repayment of principal, are going to lay a heavy burden on this country. It is therefore essential that our national production should be maintained at the very maximum consistent with reasonable expectations of demand. For this we must have internal harmony, and I am sure that every man and every woman who has spent the week in this room will go away feeling encouraged in the belief that, whatever troubles we may approach in the near future, they can be met and solved in the same spirit of mutual forbearance and good-will.

The CHAIRMAN: We have also with us, representing the Canadian Bankers' Association, Mr. Bell, General Manager of the Bank of Hamilton. I am sure you will be glad to hear a few words from him.

Mr. J. P. BELL (Hamilton): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I too am delighted at the opportunity of being present at this Industrial Conference, and I fully associate myself with Mr. Mackenzie's complimentary remarks, both to the Chairman, and to both sides of the House. We feel most sincerely that this is a very memorable occasion, and we have watched with great pleasure and delight the gradual emergence from the troubled waters to a common ground of meeting, and the steady growth of harmony and good-will which is permeating this Conference. It is very true that we are vitally concerned in its successful outcome. We are vitally concerned in seeing stability in industry, and co-operation and good-will among all classes.

At the risk of trespassing on ground in which I think many of you are much better versed than myself, and, after listening to the debates, may I take the opportunity of paying a compliment, particularly to the gentlemen on this side of the House (employees), on the very able manner in which they have presented their cases, and on the varied knowledge that they have shown on many abstruse problems and questions, such as proportional representation.

But may I be pardoned for a moment or two if I attempt to say a few words about that common bugbear, the high cost of living, or high prices, which is the real cause of the unrest. Much has been said about profiteering, monopoly and high wages, and extravagance, but there are two other factors to which little reference has been made—real scarcity and inflation. The big drop in prices expected when the war ceased did not come, in spite of the fact that the one big buyer, the Government, virtually dropped out of the market. Prices wobbled a little, but only temporarily; the trade situation was too strong. High prices have not deterred buyers, nor deprived most people of the comforts, nor indeed the luxuries of life. Who can deny that a very real reason is the scarcity of goods of all kinds, including foods? We have hoped at one time to have a large exportable surplus of wheat but the unfavourable weather in July and August seriously damaged the crops. It was a real calamity to have lost 100,000,000 bushels of wheat out of this year's crop, for the high cost of flour affects the cost of living all along the line. In other things, too, we are faced with a marked scarcity. The buying power of the people has outrun production.

The second factor to which I would draw your attention is inflation due to the enormous increases in the supplies of money and credit available in various forms, owing to the huge war borrowings by the Government. In Canada the increase in Government and bank notes, in cheques—another form of circulating medium—and in deposits, which represent potential purchasing power, during the years of war, were about eight times the normal increase in a similar pre-war period; and when two-dollars are chasing a one-dollar article prices are bound to stay up.

It has been said there is no evidence of immediate rise in prices following a creation of fresh credit by the Government; but an analysis shows that the relation between the increase in currency, in all the above forms, and higher prices, is not coin-

cident—the rise in prices lags behind the increase in currency, usually by about four or five months. The chief cause of this increase in currency is to my mind the enormous expansion of Government credit, which has permeated the whole country. If, and not real saving, accounts for the growth in deposits. It too is the real reason for the success of the Victory Loan issues and the truly stupendous sums raised by the people for these loans.

Thoughtful economists insist that if the cost of living is to come down there must be an end of this expansion of Government credit, and that economy must be the watchword in our capitals and our homes. War has always been a great obstruction to the sources of supply of goods of all kinds; and this very real scarcity of things, added to the inflation, shows that what is wanted more than anything else is work, steady, honest work, to make good the shortage of essentials which has resulted from the four years' interruption of industry and the terrible waste of war.

Now that such good feeling has been created by this historic Industrial Conference, may I close by expressing the hope that both employer and employee will go back to their tasks determined to work hard, to produce more, and to save all they can.

VOTES OF THANKS.

TO THE CHAIRMAN, THE PRESS, REPRESENTATIVES OF PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS, THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION, AND THE THIRD GROUP.

Dr. D. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentleman, I am going to take a rather unwaranted license this morning, and I am to a certain extent anticipating the Conference's coming near to a close. The natural thing would be that this resolution that I am about to move should be left until the very last, but there are certain reasons which have developed, which I think you will all quite understand, why this is not an unwise time to move a resolution.

I need not go over at any great length the week that we have spent here. It has been a great experience; it has been a great surprise; it has been a great lesson; it has been a great benefit to us in many ways; and I think, Sir, that the very first thing that has enabled this Conference to be carried on in this delightful way has been, if I may be allowed to say it, your own conduct in the Chair, and your wonderful discernment at all times of those rights that belonged to the various men who have taken part in the Conference. Because of that, Sir, I wish to take the liberty of moving a hearty vote of thanks, and I am sure it will be a unanimous vote of thanks, not only to the Government, but to you personnally for calling this Conference together, and not only so, but for your conduct in the Chair. It is something that we appreciate very much, and we believe that in any particular you have not yet failed in your attitude to either one side or the other.

There is another class whom I want to include in that. I have been told time and again that when there is a troublesome man in society—we will say a troublesome clergyman—the surest way to see that his troublesomeness should cease would be absolutely to ignore him. When a man begins to make trouble, if the newspapers would simply not mention his name, the thing would die out of itself. You have heard that, I am sure; and the reason I say this is because this country's greatness, as every man's greatness, depends to a large extent upon the press. I have no hesitation in including in this vote of thanks the gentlemen who have sat at this table day by day and who have reported the proceedings of this Conference. I do not believe there has been of late years any Conference that has received the same wide attention from the newspapers throughout Canada, throughout the United States, and, I am sure, throughout Great Britain. The reason of that is that these gentlemen here have done their work very well and very admirably; and I am perfectly certain that I am within the judgment of everyone in this House when I say that this Conference is entirely in harmony with the sentiments that I express.

There is another class of men whom I think we ought to include in the vote of thanks—the representatives of the different provinces. The majority of the provincial premiers at any rate, representatives of all the provinces have come here, I am sure at a great deal of inconvenience. They are all busy men, either preparing for elections or trying to figure out when they will have an election. I think it has meant a great deal that so many representatives of the various Provinces have come here and have taken part in this Conference and followed its proceedings so closely from day to day.

I think we ought also to include in this vote of thanks the Third Party. We are under a very great debt to these gentle-

men who have come, not allowed to vote, seldom allowed to speak, and yet ready to give their services and their advice to us whenever these were asked.

There is another class, too, I think that we ought to include in this resolution the members of the Royal Commission, particularly His Honor Judge Mathers, who came all the way from the West to sit quietly by and see what we would do with his hadiwork.

I am very glad, Mr. Chairman, to have the honour to move this resolution, seconded by my friend Mr. Moore.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: The last speaker made reference, almost at the close of his remarks, to the Royal Commission. It had been arranged that I should follow him, and therefore I must do so. But I think he qualified his remarks by mentioning the Chairman only, so I am at liberty to speak. I had the opportunity of being a member of that Commission. It was one of the most arduous duties which I ever undertook. I think I would be correct in saying that during the first thirty days, though we held sessions every day, we spent twenty-three or twenty-four nights on the train; and that was kept up duing the remainder of the work. You can certainly appreciate the manner in which the Chairman of that Commission conducted the inquiry, the energy which he exercised during those arduous days and the uniform good nature wich he was able to preserve. And believe me, when you look at the component parts of the Commission, and when you consider the many varied notions that the people throughout this Dominion desired to express, you must recognize that it needed almost a second job to sit as Chairman, to be able to remain good-tempered in the evenings, when our work was done. I have therefore much pleasure, so far as that part is concerned, in paying tribute publicly on this occasion, to the Chairman of that Commission.

I am working backwards. Tribute was paid to the Third Party, the gentlemen of the third estate. No one can complain that they have abused the opportunity of being at this Conference. Though it was understood that they were at liberty to speak and express their opinions, they have not attempted to interject any matter which has not been useful, and they have not at any time taken undue advantage of that arrangement; but their work has been done quietly in Committees, and has been one of an auxiliary and helpful character as between the other two sides of the Conference. I have therefore much pleasure also in seconding the motion so far as the gentlemen of the Third Estate are concerned.

To the provincial premiers it has always been a pleasure to be able to talk. I have served on many annual deputations going to provincial premiers and Federal premiers, asking for legislation, and we have usually succeeded that it was an annual affair, similar to a pilgrimage which had to be performed; but we never looked for much more than "sympathetic hearing and careful consideration." On this occasion we have had the opportunity of speaking to them without having also had to suffer being told that our representations would receive serious consideration. We appreciate very highly the interest that they have displayed. We appreciate the time that they have given to this Conference, and the fact that they have demonstrated by that their realization of the enormity of the problems which are being faced, and also their earnest desire to face them fairly and squarely in order that measures good may accrue. There is no one in this Conference room but would most heartily agree with the motion to convey to these gentlemen our deep appreciation and thanks for their presence here; and not only for their presence, but for the action which they have demonstrated they are willing to take. By their presence here they have demonstrated not merely their intention to give serious consideration, but their willingness, whether Grit or Tory, whether provincial or Federal, to co-operate, by sitting together around the table and discussing the common problems of Canada in a united fashion.

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. TOM MOORE: The gentlemen of the press, fellow labourers as they are—fellow sufferers sometimes! Perhaps there is no one who works harder or during more unsatisfactory hours than do the gentlemen of the press, unless it may be the doctors of the country. I am told that the gentlemen of the press are not their own masters, inasmuch as when they are sent to cover an assignment, whether it takes two hours or 24, they must stay there or the country would be asking why they did not get a report of that particular conference or that particular affair. On this occasion I have noted carefully that they have remained loyally at their posts throughout the entire time. They have sat there working assiduously in order that the public of this

country might receive the fairest and fullest knowledge of what was taking place. It has been truly stated that our Conference would be three-quarters ineffective were it not for the publicity which has been given to it through the medium of the press of this country. Conferences are useful, but Conferences of this nature, if held behind closed doors or without publicity, are ineffective. There is, in my estimation, nothing that can be more damaging to either a man's reputation or his efforts, than a conspiracy of silence, and if the press of this country had determined to ignore and stay away from a Conference of this kind, if the press representatives who came here had not diligently fulfilled their duties, then the work that we have undertaken would have been ineffective for common good. To the press, therefore, to the men who have written the articles, we express our hearty thanks and appreciation.

And now we come to the last, but assuredly not the least our worthy Chairman. I have a good deal of human sympathy for our Chairman. I shall be facing a similar position next week for the entire week. I suppose that most of you here have had the experience of sitting in the Chair at a gathering where thoughts are diversified, and you must appreciate the necessity of careful observance of all the desires of the various delegates. It is not an easy task, when a gathering is attended by a regiment of colonels, and the attempt is made to reduce them all to privates. On this occasion there are gathered together the captains of industry, men who are accustomed in their own sphere of life to being—shall we say?—the big toad in the small puddle. On this side we have the so-called captains of labour who are used to being in a similar position. Each is predominant in his particular sphere. All have assembled here desirous of doing good, desirous of saying something useful, and in a Conference of this kind, ladies and gentlemen, it is difficult to know where to stop a discussion. It means the utmost tact on the part of the Chairman to know when a discussion has reached the point at which it should be restrained; and I am sure that we must all appreciate the tact that has been shown by our Chairman this week in conducting a Conference of this nature. Although all the explosive material was available, we have been able to reach this late hour without an explosion having occurred. I feel that that is due almost exclusively to the tact of the Chairman of this meeting. Therefore no one can disagree with the motion to heartily accord our thanks to the Minister of Labour.

To say anything of the Conference and what it has accomplished—to add words to these spoken by Dr. Strachan, would be simply adding perfume to the rose. Trerefore it is unnecessary to add anything except to say that on our behalf we express our appreciation and our thanks, joined with those of the rest of the House, and we hope to make it a unanimous acclamation vote of thanks to those who have been enumerate.

Dr. STRACHAN: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I may be permitted to put this motion. I can quite understand your native modesty and your feeling about it. All those in favour of this motion will manifest by a standing vote.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

Dr. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, the motion is yours.

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Strachan and Mr. Moore, may I, without delaying the Conference seriously, presume to express briefly my personal appreciation of the very kind expressions which you have made as to the action of the Government in calling this Conference together, and my humble efforts in presiding over it.

I am grateful that the work of the Conference has been useful, and I know that every member of the Government, particularly the Prime Minister, who has personally interested himself in this great problem for the last couple of years ,will be very much gratified because of the fact that the gentlement attending this Conference, whether employers or employees, have demonstrated a unanimity of spirit and an intention to do what is right and to endeavour to build up our industrial structure upon a foundation of common justice, thereby inspiring confidence which will be followed by the necessary co-operation referred to by the Prime Minister in the message which he sent to you.

May I be pardoned for saying a word on behalf of the press, which I criticised to some extent the other morning—not the gentlemen present, but those who write the headlines in some of our newspapers. I think the gentlemen representing the press here have worked just as hard as any of us, and I have come to the conclusion that so far as their right to be recognized is concerned, they should be on a par with the other delegates. As Mr. Moore properly said, the influence of this

Conference upon the public and upon employers and workmen throughout the country will be due very largely to the efforts of the press, in addition to the spreading of the gospel of peace and co-operation by the delegates when they return to their respective places of abode.

I am sure the mover and the seconder of the motion voiced the sentiments of the Conference as to the gentlemen representing the Provincial Governments and the Royal Commission, particularly Chief Justice Mathers, who gave his time and energy so unstintingly to that task. This Conference would not have resulted, in all probability, had not that Commission done its work had not the Commission had the foresight to see the advantages to be obtained in a Conference of this sort, and included a recommendation that such a Conference should be held. Therefore I should like to say that it is quite possible that neither the Government nor your humble servant would have been instrumental in bringing about the Conference but for the recommendations of the Commission, of which Chief Justice Mathers was Chairman and doubtless the moving spirit.

Therefore, on behalf of those for whom I have presumed to speak in reply to the motion, as well as for the gentlemen composing the Third Group, who have manifested a very honest and sincere interest in the problems you have been discussing, I thank you. The fact of the Third Group being here, representing a neutral interest, will, I hope, set an example for the future that will help employers and employees to keep in mind the fact that there is a very large number of people, the interested public, who deserve consideration when they are dealing with these problems.

I beg, therefore, on behalf of the press, the Third Group, Chief Justice Mathers, and the Provincial representatives, to express the appreciation that I am sure they all feel because of the kindness of the Conference in seeing fit to make special reference to them and what they have done. Before the Conference closes, if opportunity permits and time allows, I am sure you will be delighted, as I will be, to hear from several of these gentlemen individually.

HOURS OF LABOUR AND LABOUR ORGANIZATIONS.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INABILITY OF COMMITTEES TO REPORT UNANIMOUSLY.

The CHAIRMAN: Are any of the Committees ready to report?

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW (Woodstock): Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I regret—that is possibly not the correct word—that I must announce to you that notwithstanding the gigantic efforts made by the Committees on Items Nos. 2 and 4, they have been unable to bring in a unanimous report.*

I have, however, a suggestion to humbly submit to this Conference, in the hope and the belief that it will meet with the sympathy of the delegates here present.

May I be permitted to say that I believe we have been engaged in a piece of constructive work without parallel in the history of the Dominion of Canada? We have demonstrated to the Canadian people the benefit to be derived from co-operative effort. Heretofore the great public has believed that the manufacturer was busying himself with resisting the demands of labour, and that labour was busying itself with attacks on industry. Our co-operative work at this Conference, now widely known all over the Dominion through the fine reports that have been made by the press, has shown the Canadian people that we are not simply attacking and resisting, but that we are working together for the mutual benefit of every citizen in this Dominion. To my mind, the effect of the reports of this Conference on the intelligent people of Canada will be to produce discussion amongst them on these questions, and, as an aftermath of discussion, decisions must be made. Public opinion has been defined by a great economist as the apparent consensus on any given subject by a large majority of those whose interests are involved in it. There is not a man, woman or child in the Dominion of Canada who is not interested in the questions that we have been discussing and attempting to decide during this past week.

I think it would be a great pity, especially as some of the delegates who have been most assiduous in their attendance at this Conference have perforce had to return home this morning, that there should be any division by vote. I also think that a vote on a resolution on which we cannot agree might have a harmful effect on public opinion, and might possibly tend to

*Items Nos. 2 and 4 are the following:

2. Consideration of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations respecting hours of labour.

4. Consideration of:
(a) employers' right to organize;
(b) recognition of labour unions;
(c) the right of employees to collective bargaining.

slightly embitter the side that lost by a few votes, and thus hurt the cause of that side by allowing a spirit of antagonism to arise which we should be careful to suppress.

I have therefore to suggest, as we cannot bring in unanimous resolutions regarding these two items, that the Chairmen of the respective Committees lay on the table the findings of their respective Committees, and that those reports be embodied in the proceedings of the Conference. The great public will then have before them the views of the different interests as presented here, and will be able thus to continue the discussions and come to their decisions. We have been congratulating ourselves upon the unanimity with which we have been able to proceed, but in the affairs of men there always comes a time when we must agree to differ. For our part, we wish to show the people of Canada that we can differ and still respect and admire the opinions of the other side. Possibly some of us might be able to go a long way on the road that is desired by the other side, but we too must respect the great body of men who could not possibly be represented at this Conference.

I therefore suggest to you, Sir, in the hope that the gentlemen on the other side of the House will concur, that the respective Committees be asked to bring in their reports and lay them on the table. I do not think it would be wise that they be re-debated in toto, but I think it would be quite in order for two or three speakers on either side, in ten-minute addresses, to present their views to this Conference and to the great public as to why they think the principles embodied in the respective reports should be adopted.

Mr. R. A. RIGG (Winnipeg): Mr. Chairman, in the absence of Mr. Moore I rise for the purpose of expressing agreement with the suggestion that has been made. I want, however, to indicate briefly my reasons for so doing. I believe that, so far as the broad question of principle is concerned, there is expressed practical agreement, but that, so far as the questions of detail are concerned, there is some difference of opinion. I think it might be said that this difference of opinion with regard to certain deails of more or less consequence is of such a nature that it has successfully resisted the herculean efforts that have been made in Committee and by conference to overcome them, and that as a consequence that difference of opinion seems to be incapable of adjustment at the present moment as to these specific features. In the Committee there has been going on a tug-of-war which, to one who has been on the outside and has had some little opportunity of looking in, has been of a very interesting character, and I am sure that both sides have put forth the very efforts that they possibly could, in the hope a reaching a solution of the problems with which they were confronted.

My special reason for seconding this motion, if you wish to put it so, or of agreeing with the suggestion, if it is in the nature of a suggestion only, is that when this is done the findings of the respective Committees will be before the Government, and it will then be the duty of the Government to determine what is the real value of the respective opinions, and what line of action shall be taken in drafting and carrying out legislation dealing with these questions as affecting the general welfare of the country at large. When such legislation comes before the Dominion Parliament there will be ample opportunity for eahh side respectively to present its case to the Government, in order that the mind of Parliament may be influenced to the fullest degree, and instructed as to what is the real problem before the country. On these grounds, on behalf of President Moore, I beg to agree with the suggestion that has been made.

The CHAIRMAN: May the Chair assume to congratulate the Conference upon what I believe to be the very best action possible under the circumstances? You agreed at the opening of this Conference that if by a majority of votes you adopted a resolution or motion, it thereby became a recommendation. If you have found, by working through your Committees, that you were almost agreed and yet could not exactly join upon any given recommendation to the Conference, I think it is wise that the views of each should be recorded in the manner suggested, and be laid before the Government as is proposed. I therefore commend your action, and congratulate you upon what I believe to be the best solution, under the circumstances, of a rather difficult position.

I regret to say that I will have to retire from the Conference for a short time, owing to a message just received. I will ask Mr. Magrath to kindly preside.

Mr. SHAW: Mr. Chairman, do you think I should make a formal motion? I am quite willing that it should be put as a formal motion.

Mr. RIGG: There has been no objection.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I think the Conference is unanimous. However, to make certain, we might regard Mr. Shaw's suggestion as a motion. What is the pleasure of the Conference?

The motion was put and carried unanimously.

Mr. CHARLES A. MAGRATH then took the Chair.

Mr. GILLIS: Do I understand that the resolutions of those Committees are to be laid on the table without any further discussion)

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Magrath): I understood the suggestion to be that the resolutions should be presented by the respective sides with such remarks as two or three speakers on each side might see fit to make.

HOURS OF LABOUR

REPORT OF EMPLOYERS' REPRESENTATIVES — INVESTIGATION BY INDUSTRIAL REPRESENTATIVE COMMISSIONS RECOMMENDED.

The Conference then took up the Report of the Employers' Representatives on the Committee on Hours of Labour.

Mr. M. P. WHITE (Toronto): The members of your Committee appointed to represent employers beg to submit the following resolution:—

Resolved that appropriate Government Commissions, composed of an equal representation of employers and employees of the various industrial, producing and distributing industries, should be appointed to undertake investigations as to the adaptability of the hours of labour principles of the Peace Treaty to the different industries of the country, and to report as early as possible.

(Sgd.) Melville P. White.
Fred. Armstrong.
R. M. Trowern.

Mr. WHITE: This is in respect of hours of labour. In submitting this resolution on behalf of the employers I have to state that we appreciate the sincerity of the members on the other side; in our Conference we had the best sort of feeling from them; and while we agree to submit the different resolutions I think there is no very serious difference between them. We on our side wish a very thorough investigation of the recommendations which have been made by the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, and they on their side want practically the same thing, excepting that they want a little more prompt action taken by the Government. There is not so very much difference between us.

In reference to the evidence which has been given on both sides regarding this question of hours of labour, a great deal has been said from the two points of view, and I would just like to leave this thought with both sides of the Conference that these statements on the part of labour should receive very careful consideration and study from the members on our side. They are worth study and consideration. We are always inclined, after the excitement of a meeting is over, to go back and think only of our own side of a question. The best way to get at the solution of difficulties is to put one's self in the place of the other fellow; and I say to the other side that they should give consideration to the arguments and evidence which we have presented from our side. We have tried to make clear the economic situation in a very definite way, and I submit that they should not pass lightly over those arguments and statements, but should at least study them and find out what the real truth is regarding them. If our statements about the economic situation are true, they are worth the most serious consideration on the part of all the elements of the population of Canada, because they affect the whole people. I leave that thought with the Conference, and will not say anything further.

REPORT OF EMPLOYERS' REPRESENTATIVES—EQUAL EIGHT-HOUR DAY RECOMMENDED.

Mr. J. A. McCLELLAND (Montreal): Mr. Chairman and fellow delegates,—On behalf of the employers' side of the Committee who were in consultation with the Committee whose Chairman has just reported, I want to submit to the Conference what we submitted to the Committee and were unable to agree upon:

That we agree with the recommendations and findings of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, and urge the adoption of an eight-hour day bylaw throughout the Dominion, with due regard and recognition of the principle heretofore where extra overtime, and, if possible, extension.

In industries subjected to seasonal and climatic conditions such as threshing, driving and logging, if it can be established by investigation that the operation of such a law is impracticable, then exemption shall be granted such industries from the operation of the law.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, we attempted to come to an agreement on this question. Possibly the difference between the two groups was not so great. It was just this. The employers asked for direct immediate application of the law to an eight-hour day.

They are not agreeable to having this matter submitted to any further investigation by commission until it has been made law. The matter that has been submitted here during the discussion of this subject has proved, or ought to prove, that in all the years that have passed the requests or demands of labour have been passed on from one to another, and no direct action has been taken, until the matter has practically exhausted itself and has perhaps become forgotten. A Royal Commission has been sugested by the employers as a means of overcoming the difficulty. We on our side contend, Mr. Chairman, that we are discussing the findings of a Royal Commission, and that another Royal Commission which, if appointed, would necessarily require to represent the parties in dispute, would in all human probability disagree just as our committee representing both parties has disagreed, and in the end no advance would be made and we should be where we were at the beginning.

We expect that the Government will take cognizance of the claims that have been made by us, and will incorporate into the statutes of the country a law providing that the industrial workers of this country shall not be forced to work such hours as they have been working, to the detriment of the manhood and the womanhood of the nation. We find that the hours of labour that are to-day worked in the majority of the industries of this country are such that they do not make for the betterment of the citizenship of this Dominion.

I submit this resolution, as from the labour section.

REPORT OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THIRD GROUP — RECOMMENDATION OF LAWS BASED ON TREATY OF PEACE AND REPORT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COMMISSION.

Mr. CALVIN LAWRENCE (Ottawa): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I believe that this is the first time that the representatives on a Committee from the Third Group have been unable to agree with either party—either the Government or the Opposition. We also believe that there is not a very wide difference between the conclusions they have arrived at, but we could not agree to either resolution as drafted by these two parties; so we agreed on a resolution of our own. My colleagues and I believe that this resolution would cover the position of both sides of the House, both the Government and the Opposition. The resolution reads as follows:

We approve of the principle regarding employment and hours of labour set forth in the Treaty of Peace and in paragraphs 50 to 53 inclusive of the Report of the Royal Commission, and would recommend that the Governments of Canada enact legislation providing for such in all industries where it is now established, by agreement, at the earliest opportunity, and, after due investigation by a Commission, composed of representatives of employers and employees representing the various industries, legislation be enacted by the Governments of Canada providing for the same to be extended in all industries where it can be applied, having due regard to the curtailment of production and distribution.

Our legislation provides for immediate legislation in all industries where a day of eight hours or less is now worked. In clauses 50 to 53 of the Report of the Royal Commission this matter is especially mentioned, and that is why we have referred to those clauses in our resolution. Clauses 50 to 53 of the Royal Commission's Report state:

50. A shorter day is most needed in industries that are fatiguing, monotonous, or under conditions, such as heat, dust, cramped position, etc.

51. The number of hours worked should not be fixed by the ability to work them without undue fatigue, but should be based scientifically upon the demands of industry.

52. In many industries in Canada the eight-hour day has already been adopted, and it has been recognized by the Peace Treaty. We recommend that it be established by law throughout Canada, with due regard for the above consideration. Such legislation should provide for a weekly rest of at least twenty-four hours which should include Sunday whenever practicable.

53. Where a shorter day is now worked the enactment of such legislation should in no way interfere with such practice or with its extension.

Therefore our resolution provides just what was agreed to unanimously by the representatives of organized labour on that Commission. It was not the unanimous opinion of the Commission, but the opinion of the majority. We think that is pretty well covered in this report.

We are of the opinion that it is advisable not to mention the industries to which the law should apply immediately, as we are not in a position to name such industries. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there a lady or gentleman in this room or in the Dominion who can honestly and truthfully state that he or she can name the industries in Canada to which this law should apply at the present time. Therefore we believe that it is not advisable that an act should be passed, either by the local legislatures or the Dominion Parliament which might at any time be made applicable to certain industries when no one is in a posi-

tion to name the industries to which it should apply.

I desire to say—and I intend to say it in my opening remarks—that I was more than gratified to observe the pleasant and honest manner in which the two parties tried to get together on this question. Our session was of the most pleasant nature, and I believe that both parties equally tried to come to some common conclusion in this matter.

Dr. STRACHAN: Might I ask a question, Mr. Chairman? I do not want to interrupt, but I am really anxious to get a little light with reference to this resolution that legislation should be enacted covering those industries where the 8-hour day is now in effect.

Mr. CALVIN LAWRENCE: Or a shorter day than the 8-hour day.

Dr. STRACHAN: What I want to know is: what is the underlying idea of getting legislation for the thing that now is?

Some EMPLOYEES' DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. CALVIN LAWRENCE: My idea, in which I think my colleague agrees, is that if the employers and the employees have already got together and established a 44-hour week or an 8-hour day, it must be working out well or we would hear some complaint about it. Therefore, I see no reason why any person should hesitate to favour the immediate enactment of a law declaring that that shall continue. With due regard to both parties, it is in my opinion better to have legislation in order that the workmen may known what to expect from their employers until the law is amended. I think that applies equally to the employers: if the law provides for an 8-hour day or for a 44-hour week, the employer may say to his employees that they have not the right to violate the law, but should live up to its provisions. I do not believe the law would hurt the employer; I think that on the contrary it would be to his benefit.

The question may probably be raised whether in some industries the jurisdiction is that of the provincial governments or of the Dominion Government. That is why our resolution is worded "the Governments of Canada." It is intended by us to mean that provincial legislatures should pass this law where they have jurisdiction, and to request that the Dominion Government should do likewise where it has jurisdiction.

With reference to the appointment of a Commission. That was one thing that we hesitated about inserting in the resolution, because there have been so many Commissions appointed and so much has been said about Commissions that such a suggestion is looked upon by some people as a joke and we did not wish to be a party to a joke. But we believe that neither the Dominion Government nor any of the legislatures nor any of the members of these bodies can say to what industries an 8-hour law should apply or to what industries it should not apply. If a Commission were appointed, all parties would have an opportunity of presenting their views and the legislatures and the Dominion Government would be able to arrive at some conclusion.

I desire to say a few words, in conclusion, in regard to production. The resolution says, "Having due regard to the entitlement of production and distribution." The employers, I believe, have honestly contended that if a shorter working day were established in some of the industries it would curtail production and they do not want curtailment. The contention of the employees, which in our opinion is just as honest, is that there are industries to which the 8-hour day is not at present applied and to which it could be applied without curtailing production, and they are as emphatic in their declaration as the employers that they do not wish to do anything that would curtail production. I believe that we are all agreed on that. Therefore the Commission could take that into consideration, and in its investigations could hear both sides. We see no reason, therefore, why there should be any argument or disagreement between the two parties. I am a stranger to a great many of the delegates on both sides of this House, but I may say that all my life has been spent in doing what I could, not only in the interests of working men and working women, but also in the interests of the public. The public is a big factor, and at the present time I would not for a moment think of doing or saying anything that would in any respect jeopardize the interests of either party. In the first place, who is the public? There is no person in this room, among either the employers or the employees, who would not be considered as included in the public. When you hurt the public, then, you hurt both the employers and the employees.

I have great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in presenting this resolution on behalf of Mr. Rogers and myself, representatives of the Third Group.

Mr. J. W. BRUCE (Toronto): I think that at this time I can possibly speak on the question without any reflections, be-

cause I happened to be a member of the Commission. I am going to try to analyze the situation in as few words as possible in the limited time at my disposal, to show you the reason why I endorse the majority report of the Commission. The Commission was appointed because of the widespread industrial unrest. All over the civilized world to-day we find a condition of seething discontent, and men and governments are asking themselves the reason for this discontent. The Commission surveyed the horizon of the industries of this country and found that the great factor was the insecurthat the physical development and the main factors, that was the one on which we had to center our attention. A great deal has been said here about the amity existing between the two sides of the House, and those things on which we have agreed at this time will have a moral value; but they will be absolutely useless in allaying the industrial unrest if they have not some really practical result. Therefore I was hoping that this Conference would have endorsed the Report of the Royal Commission in its entirety, and have gone on record in favour of an 8-hour day.

At the opening of the session the Prime Minister, in dealing with the problem, said that the physical development and the welfare of the workers should not be sacrificed for the development of industry—a remark which you gentlemen generously applauded. The Hon. Mackenzie King also made this statement: "Industry exists for the sake of humanity, and not humanity for the sake of industry;" and you applauded that statement. I am going to make a statement, and I do not know whether you will applaud it or not. If we are to have a higher type of civilization, human beings must not be sacrificed for the development of an unjust economic order.

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRUCE: If these statements are concurred in, then, while men are out of work, and are unable to secure work, the hours of labour are all too long, and we must at least attempt to adjust that condition. Sir John Willison, who is present in this audience, made an exhaustive survey, I believe, and in a pamphlet issued by him, he says:

> It is only by methods of conciliation, sympathetic appeals, and laborious efforts towards a better understanding that the class war can be abated.

Sir John Willison knows what he is talking about; he has studied the economic system; he knows the fundamental causes of unrest, as men like myself do. I have travelled this world; I have worked hard, like some of you gentlemen; I have not gained fame or fortune, but have been struggling in the interest of the under-dog, attempting to educate him to improve his condition, and I am going to go on. You ask yourself why this revolutionary thought? Revolutionary thought is born of the injustice of the present economic situation. You have dealt with housing; you have dealt with conditions in industry; but I am going to tell you, as one who travels across this continent from time to time, that we have an intolerable condition among the workers, and they intend to see a new order of society; they intend to see that the worker has a new status in industry, and an opportunity for a higher and a better life.

So far as the question is concerned, we must appeal to reason. We must at least attempt to establish fixed standards under which men, women and children might be employed. We find in this industry that by the development of machine production the worker to-day is producing more and more, but is unable to buy those things which he produces. Men on your side of the House have challenged the statement that men can produce as much in eight hours as they did in ten. I am not going to stand here to argue from that standpoint, but I am going to tell you that, with the advance of science, with the development of the machine, and with the research that is being conducted, and the application of these to industry men are producing more. That statement is irrefutable. You have only to look at this little booklet, which is authentic, which is a survey of existing conditions in industry, to find that working ten hours a day in the Ford automobile Plant in February, 1913, 16,000 male employees produced 16,000 Ford cars. In the same month in the year 1914 you will find that working an 8-hour day, 15,800 male employees produced 26,000 cars. These are figures that are irrefutable. But did the workers in that industry get any advantage from that particular condition? Have you men who have made advances because of the scientific production in your industry handed on the worker his share in that development? You have not. You know you have not, because to-day the struggle is greater, the struggle is keener, and we have a richer class and a poorer class in a greater ratio than ever before.

Some DELEGATES: No, no.

Mr. BRUCE: I say we have, and I will argue it out with you some day on the public platform.

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. BRUCE: Industry and its economic relation to the population is a thing that you men are vitally concerned in. So are we, because every strike that takes place is of such serious importance that it is a real economic loss to any community. No one is going to claim that we win by strikes, because we lose every time; but to prove the real losses to the community, you have only got to look to the startling figures contained in the official records of the Dominion Government. The public generally are against strikes. Many of you have been concerned about the community. I am concerned about the community, because the worker himself is practically 95 per cent of the community. For that reason I am interested in him. From the year 1901 to the year 1911 the total loss in working days due alone to strikes for the reduction of hours was 938,249. The total loss in strikes since the first of this year until June 30, when hours of labour was one of the greatest factors in the demands that have been made by the men, amounted to the enormous figures of 2,118,379 working days. Can you realize what a serious loss that is to the community? Then, look at the total loss due to strikes, and see the magnitude of the problem that confronts us. The total loss from the year 1901 to June, 1919, was 14,937,229 working days.

By force of economic power we have been able to establish the working day. I, like Dr. Strachan, want to know why we should establish by law an 8-hour day when we have established it by force of economic power? We are not going to be satisfied with the 8-hour day; we are going to reduce the hours of labour to a point where every man, woman, and child will be guaranteed the right and the security of an existence. That is what we are going to fight for, and, while you may not agree with me, I am going to say that it is the greatest and highest ideal that men should labour to bring about the shorter hours which we claim as our portion. You in luxury—and it is luxury; dont say it is not, because I know the kind of homes that some of you gentlemen come from; and when I compare them with the homes of the men down Sydney or in the mining districts of Fernie, or in some of the slum districts in the cities, I say it is deplorable. When I see the workingmens outputting things—they are not homes, they are hovels; and while they may have free light and running water, it is because the light comes in in the daytime and the water when it is raining—I say it is a deplorable condition. If anyone chooses to carry on a systematic survey of the housing conditions of this country, they will find that what I say is true. In the city of Vancouver I had the opportunity of taking some of the members of the Royal Commission into a place where we found twenty-two Chinese, including a woman and three children, all crowded into a compartment about which they had themselves built in a room where we had to stoop to get in. If you tell me that those are desirable conditions I am not going to agree with you, and I will fight to the end that those conditions may be remedied and adjusted.

Organized labour, like organized industry, or anything else that is organized or centralized, has its value; and, while you may fear the results of organization, while you may fear that it is going to interfere with the operations of your machinery of production, I am going to say that you are entirely wrong. I am going to say, and I believe that the members of the building industry on the other side of the House will prove what I say, that by dealing with the organized workers in this Dominion they have had more satisfactory conditions than they ever had when dealing with unorganized labour.

There is more. You heard what Col. Margesson said in speaking of conditions in England. There you found that the building trade was the first to establish a National Industrial Council. It was established on the 8-hour basis and the 44-hour week, and to-day it is the best operating Industrial Council in the whole of the British Empire. I say to you: have no fear of the shorter work-day, have no fear of the right of organization, the right of collective bargaining, and the recognition of the Union; rather endeavor to improve conditions as they exist to-day. The radical opinions expressed by many men to-day, and which are to be found in operation in certain sections of the country, are generally engendered by the radical action of employers, not only here but the world over. Mr. Jett Lauck told you the same thing. He told you that the results of his investigations in the United States convinced him that the radical action of many employers was responsible for the revolutionary state of mind of a number of members of the

working class. Therefore, I say to you that it is possible for this Conference, if its members rise to that height to which I think they should rise, to remedy conditions, and to grant to the workers the thing that the Commission found they were entitled to, namely, a shorter work-day.

Mr. J. B. THOMSON (Vancouver): I am quite heartily in accord with the resolution of the Third Group, with one exception, namely, the time. If that resolution set as the date the ratification of the Peace Treaty by all nations, I think possibly the majority of the employers would support it.

This is a crucial question for us as a nation. We do not know what all nations are going to do. If we put legislation on the statutes books now, we might put ourselves in such a position that we could not complete with other nations of the world.

Mr. S. R. PARSONS (Toronto): I quite agree with the statement of the last speaker, and I rise to support the motion which has been brought in by our section of the Committee dealing with the question of the hours of labour.

Let me say at the outset that I have a very great sympathy with the so-called labouring class. We must, however, face this question together. It will never do for us to be divided and to feel as we go through life that there are two parties armed to the teeth, each with its own views and its own actions.

I should like to say that, so far as the hours of labour are concerned, we feel that if this matter be relegated to a Royal Commission it will mean that they will have sufficient time to thoroughly study the question. The fact must not be overlooked that the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, whose report we have been studying at this Conference, had only a few weeks to run over this entire country and make some sort of a hurried report in order to present it to Parliament. No one can gainsay the truth of the statement, even admitting the fine character of the work which they did, that they had no time to go into the individual industries of this country, so as to understand what a change in the working hours would mean. Therefore, when we ask that this question should be referred to a Commission, it is with the view that that Commission shall have sufficient time, not only to inquire into the conditions governing all the different industries of this country, but also to consider the legislation of other countries with whom we are associated in trade, whose findings in this matter we cannot afford to ignore. This is a young country, and it would be the greatest possible mistake from a national standpoint for us to tie ourselves up to a programme which we might afterwards find would not be carried out by the other countries of the world with whom we do business, and that therefore we would be tied hand and foot.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the question of shortening the hours of labour is somewhat experimental. I am sure we all sympathize with the view that men should not work longer than is necessary. I do, and I can state that very seriously and without any reservation whatsoever. I do not know that I would say we would be better for coming to a time when we should "toil not neither should we spin," because I have always held the view that a reasonable amount of work is the best thing for any human being.

I have said that the question of the hours of labour is somewhat experimental. That is very clearly set forth in two despatches in our papers this morning. Allow me to read them, because they have an extremely important bearing on the subject. The first is from Paris, as follows:

Paris, September 19.—The bad situation in the exchange market continues to be commented upon by the French press. As for a remedy, the newspapers are unanimous in the view that one would be supplied by the intensive development of national production; thus admitting of imports being reduced to a low minimum. In addition, the Figaro suggests that it may be necessary to permit some flexibility in the application of the eight-hour law:

The other despatch to which I wish to draw your attention reads as follows:

Paris, September 19.—A. Merriham, secretary of the Metal Workers' Union, created a sensation at the Labour Federation Convention in Lyons yesterday by denouncing "the wave of immorality which threatens to submerge all classes of society—the working class more than any other."

Mr. Merriham, who is one of the Socialists who conferred with the German Socialists at Zimmerwald, Switzerland, during the war, and who formerly was one of the most aggressive labour leaders in France, took the floor to defend the executive committee of the Federation against criticisms by the extremists for the fiasco which marked the proposed general strike of July 21 last.

He ridiculed the pretentions of extremists in labour organizations who talked of such plans as a four-hour day, and said what organized labour needed was to get back to work. "You talk of a revolutionary situation," he said, "but left to itself the proletariat could accomplish nothing. The war has sharpened all appetites and provoked all sorts of covetousness in all circles, even among workers. Idealism has foundered under base material preoccupations. "Money is everything! No one wants any-

thing but money. We must save the working class from that wave of immorality."

Mr. Merrham's speech made a deep impression on the delegates, which was evidenced in a great ovation as he left the platform.

Now, Sir, money is a relative term. I have seen the time when a five-cent piece was a good deal of money to me. So there are conditions of life in which a little money means a great deal and goes a very long way. I would just like to say, therefore—and I thing those despatches bear me out in the statement—that the matter of hours of labour is a question very largely of experiment at the present time.

There is one other thing that occurs to me, that perhaps on both sides we have forgotten to a considerable extent. We read in our papers in these days, and hear on the floor of legislative assemblies and other places, a great deal about the nationalization of this, that, and the other thing, in connection with our business and our material life in this Dominion. I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to my fellow-delegates on both sides, that in my opinion the greatest need in Canada to-day is that every citizen should nationalize himself and herself. We are living in an age when we do not consider as we should the needs of our great country. If Canada is to be great and prosperous, and if it is to have a future such as we all hope for, it will be simply by combining together the interests of all the citizens of the country, and each and all working towards a common goal. We can never make any progress as long as we are simply opposed to each other. Progress must come about by good-will. With good-will on both sides I do not believe we would have as much industrial unrest as we have. You can find industries here, there, and everywhere, in which there is a spirit of harmony, but outside there is some peculiar cause at work which disturbs them. Now, let me make myself quite clear. There are grievances that ought to be remedied; but we have fancied grievances; and when the honourable member of this House on the other side said that we were living under an unjust economic order, that statement might fairly be questioned. There are things that ought to be righted, but that does not mean that we are ready to overturn the whole of our organized society and government. That thing has been tried, and if I understand the feeling of the people of Canada to-day they say: "We will have none of it; we have a right to say something about these things." Recently in Toronto, before a Commission of which I was a member, a business agent of one of the unions, which I believe to be one of the international unions—and I think it rather strange for such a statement to come from such a source, stated this:

It was the workers that won the war, and now it is for them to start up the industries and run them; they neither care a continental whether they pay or not.

Then, again, he said—and these are his own admitted words before the Commission:

By a system of graft, bribery, and political corruption the capitalistic class has got the Government to work for them.

Now, let me say further that my friend who preceded me a moment or two ago was one of my colleagues on the Labour Appeal Board. He is a friend of mine; we had the most pleasant associations on that Board as long as we were there.

The CHAIRMAN: The time for adjournment has about arrived.

Mr. PARSONS: I shall close soon; I will leave that statement; but I want to refer to a statement recently made in the British House of Commons by the great labour leader, the Right Honourable Mr. Barnes, in which he spoke of those who wanted to pull down the pillars of state on the off-chance of something issuing from the ruins more to their liking.

I would like, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if we could feel a greater interest in each other. My friends, I appeal to you as a citizen of this country, and I am sure we all feel, can we not say outside what we have been saying to each other here? Cannot we bring about a better spirit among us? Cannot we go out into the world and feel that, although there are grievances which need to be rectified, we are trying to help, each one of us, to bring about a new order, a better order, when men shall respect each other, and their rights shall be considered fairly and honestly.

Mr. TOM MOORE: My object in rising is to make a motion that we continue in session until this one question is settled, as I feel that it would be unfortunate to adjourn and afterwards have to continue discussion on the same subject. There are many matters bearing on this subject, but I am not going very fully into the discussion. We have presented a resolution; the employers have presented their case also; and the third group have also presented one. I would move, Mr. Chairman, that these three resolutions be embodied in the record.

Mr. A. MONRO GRIER: That has been already agreed to.

Mr. TOM MOORE: Then I apologize. In doing so, I want to make a note of correction relative to one statement which has just been made about society being overturned. I think Mr. Parsons said that there was no desire on their part that society should be overturned, but that they were desirous of taking steps towards betterment. I just want to make this note for the record, that if the members of organized labour had been desirous that society should have been overturned, we would not be members of the International Trades Union movement, but we would have been all O.B.U.; and I want to point out very forcibly that it was the Trades Union movement that stood as a bulwark between overturning and sensible evolution during this past year.

Some EMPLOYEES' DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr. MOORE: Therefore, the remark that the asking for an 8-hour day would be an overturning of society is in my estimation going to a little exaggeration. We have spoken and we heard of the competition of other countries. Surely our friends on the other side know what other countries are doing and proposing to do. The Resolution which we have introduced is based on the British Bill which is now before the House of Commons—the Bill which provides for the general establishment of the 8-hour day, agreed to by the employers of Britain in National Conference such as this one; embodied in a Bill and introduced by the Government of Great Britain; including all classes of society, and making provision for exemption where that is shown to be necessary, just as our resolution provides. Italy, Germany, New South Wales and other companies have similar Bills introduced, and Australiahas had such legislation probably longer than some people in this hall have lived. So why talk of society being overturned when you speak of an 8-hour day? In my estimation this debate seems to have centred on the dollars and cents side of the 8-hour day, and I want to leave the impression with the country that the 8-hour day is not a question of dollars and cents, but centres on human happiness; and if it is necessary that the primary cost of raw materials, overhead charges caused by land speculation, and intermediate profits, and some other costs that go into the prices of articles should be reduced in order to overcome the granting of an 8-hour day, let us do it, but do not let us always say that labour must always be the last to receive any concession.

I would say seriously that we ask the country to judge of the three resolutions. Perhaps there is not so much difference in the real fundamentals, but there is much difference in the time, in the method of application, and as to the results that may ultimately accrue. I know that the country as a whole is ready. Mr. Parsons says that the Commission of which I was a member, of which Chief Justice Mathers was Chairman, had only two or three weeks in which to investigate this question. I want to point out that it was thoroughly investigated for two or three months in 1910 by a Committee of the House of Commons, before which evidence from all parts of the world was produced. Their report is not in pamphlet form, because you would require two hands to carry it. It is a book several inches thick; and a Bill was introduced founded on the report of that Commission, which favoured the 8-hour day. Are we younger to-day than we were at that period? I think we are a little older in industry; I think we are better established in industry; and if it was possible for a commission at that time, after a thorough investigation, to bring in a favourable report, and if since that time we have had numerous other investigations, provincial and federal, why should we have another Commission on purpose to take up a little more time after the Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, who even after three or four weeks found no reason to vary the findings of previous Commissions? The workers of this country say: Give us legislation, but do not give us a Commission on this one point". That is our case as we present it.

Mr. PARSONS: I ask as a privilege to say that it was not in reference to the 8-hour day that I made the remark in regard to the overturning of society. I made it in reference to the statement made as to our living under an unjust economic order.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW: In making the suggestions that the reports of these respective Committees should be laid on the table in a body for the proceedings of this Conference, I also suggested that the reports might be followed by two or three short speeches on either side. I rather regret that Mr. Bruce and Mr. Pearsons

have opened up the whole broad question again after the hours and hours that were spent. Speaking personally, and believing that I express the sentiment of the majority of those behind me, I say that we recognize the principle of the 8-hour day as embodied in the Peace Treaty; but we ask for a Commission because we believe that sufficient consideration has not been given to the effect of an 8-hour day on production, its possible effect on our export trade, on the farming community, and on the retail merchants, and its effect on industries whose products are the raw materials of the secondary industries. It has been clearly shown that there are industries working on primary products which, if the primary industries were working on short time, would result in the secondary industries being shut down. That must be taken into consideration. Now, Canada is a comparatively young country, with a small, scattered population, and essentially agricultural. We have immense resources, almost entirely undeveloped. Consideration must be given to them. We are not trying to burke the 8-hour day as embodied in the Peace Treaty, but we want due consideration to be given to the effect of an 8-hour day on these very essential points, and we think that a Commission should investigate this matter and let the country know the facts.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Magrath): It is now twenty minutes to one. The reports have been received, and, notwithstanding the desire of gentlemen to continue the discussion, I think it is probably the consensus of opinion that the discussion should cease now.

The Conference adjourned to meet at 2.30 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Conference resumed at 2.30 p.m., Hon. Senator Robertson in the Chair.

DEMOCRATIC MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT WORK.

REPORT OF EMPLOYERS' REPRESENTATIVES—A QUESTION ENTIRELY FOR THE GOVERNMENT AND ITS EMPLOYEES.

Mr. JOHN R. SHAW (Woodstock): Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to submit the report of the Committee on this side of the House on Item No. 6:

6. Consideration of the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations that the findings of the Commission be put into effect in all work executed for the Government where the principles of democratic management can be applied.

We could not agree on this question. On our side of the House I beg to present this report:

The undersigned members of your Committee beg leave to report that the matter referred to them does not in their judgment come within their province, but that it is entirely a question between the Government and their employees concerned.

(Signed) H. Shaw,
Angus McLean,
T. R. Deacon.

In the words of the poet, let them skin their own skunks.

Mr. HUGH BLAIN (Toronto): Mr. Chairman, in explaining to the Conference the position of the Committee on this side of the House, I may say that, in examining the Report of the Royal Commission, we cannot see where there is any direct reference to this question, although we felt that if any civil servant had been subject to injustice of any kind he should have the right of appeal to some one. We were prepared to compromise with the Committee in so far as that went, and the resolution that we have proposed, and which we imagined on our first meeting met the views of all parties, turned out to be not acceptable to the other side of the House. We have had a good many meetings of the Committee, and it has been impossible to reach a common understanding on this question. Under the circumstances we felt that it was our duty to submit the report which has been read by Mr. Shaw, the leader of this side of the House.

The opinion of the members of that Committee—I speak particularly of my own.

The opinion of the members of that occupied an entirely different position from that occupied by an ordinary employer. In it is centered the sovereign rights of the people, and it would be an invasion of the rights of the Government and of the House of Commons for us to say that the members of the Civil Service should be taken from under their control and placed on a level with workers in the ordinary avocations of life.

REPORT OF EMPLOYEES' REPRESENTATIVES—FAVOURS GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES HAVING RIGHT OF APPEAL AND WAGES AND CONDITIONS EQUAL TO THOSE OF PRIVATE EMPLOYEES—THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. FRANK GRIERSON (Ottawa): Mr. Chairman, in the vocabulary of youth there is no such word as "can't", but I must confess that it is impossible to treat the subject we have in hand now in the time which it has been necessary to allot to it. I shall attempt to go over the hurdles as fast as it is possible to do so.

To make intelligible the remarks which I have to make, I think it would be wise to read the document which we hope to be allowed to lay on the Table in accordance with the arrangement. It says:

> We concur in the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations that the findings of the Commission should be put into effect in all works controlled by all Government bodies where the principle of democratic management can be applied.
>
> We further recommend that employees of all Government bodies should be entitled to the right of appeal under the Industrial Disputes Act, so long as that Act remains upon the statute book of Canada.
>
> We further recommend that the wages and working conditions of employees of Governments should not be less favourable than those which now exist for similar workers in the employment of private individuals or corporations.
>
> (Signed) F. Grierson,
> A. R. Mosher,
> J. A. Gilles.

For the purpose of my remarks I trust to be allowed to perform a complete metamorphosis of the bodies taking part in this discussion, by moving the two bodies into one, and calling them "Employers." All the representatives here, even the spectators, are employers in the sence of the argument which I propose to offer. Even those of us who are employees have the dual capacity of employers.

I wish to strike this note, first of all, Sir, that the Civil Servant have taken the foremost place in regard to the realization of higher ideals in carrying on the Canadian public service. In the United States they have what is called a Civil Service League, and public men outside of the Service take an interest in it; but here we attend to this matter ourselves. I wish to say, therefore, that we are not contending for higher remuneration or a change in hours; in fact we are going to contend that the Service to which we belong costs millions of dollars more than it should cost. Now, that is a high ideal. We are contending that there should be a complete reformation; ;that if ever there was need of a reformation there is need of one in our Service; and I am blaming nobody. We are thinking only of Canada's good name as the owner of a business, in order that that good name should go around the world to our credit and not to our discredit. My good friend Mr. Blain, if I my allude to him by name, pointed out that we must be different from other kinds of industry. I will admit that we have been different in the past, and I am going to point out in as few words as possible what that difference means to us all as employers doing business in the name of Canada Company, Unlimited.

Paragraph 12 of the Report of the Royal Commission has for item No. 1, "Organization and Classification.". Sir George Murray, at the invitation of the Prime Minister shortly after coming into office, came to this country and made a report. He began with ministers, and showed that they were overwhelmed with routine, and could not attend to matters of policy, which were their immediate sphere; that they had to deal with the appointment of clerks and such like details, which he recommended should be left to others. In regard to the work actually carried out by the Service, he pointed out the extraordinary example of three big departments carrying on three big pieces of work of a like nature—the Public Works Department, the Department of Railways and Canals, and the Marine Department. They were carrying on great public works on capital account and on maintenance account. The Public Works Department deals with waters and wharves; the Department of Railways and Canals includes maintainence and capital account; and the Marine Department operates the St. Lawrence ship canal and river. In regard to classification, he said the service was entirely top heavy. His criticisms were sweeping. He pointed out that in three years the appointments to higher ranks had increased with a remarkable percentage, and that the appointments to the lower ranks had actually decreased.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chair feels impelled to remind the speaker that he should confine his remarks to the motion or subject that was referred to the Committee, and not go into details, which might be desirable if we had time.

Mr. GRIERSON: I will try to do so. I was trying to show that we should have machinery that would be as useful to us as

it is to the industrial interests. If you feel already that there is need of improvement in the Service I shall pass that over.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that is quite well understood.

Mr. GRIERSON: I mentioned the fact that, through having no public opinion aroused, the organization of Civil Servants had attempted to do their bit in keeping this matter before the Government in an effort to get more efficient conditions for the people of Canada. We have been the butt of the satirist, and have suffered "the whips and scorns of time, the oppressor's rage and the proud man's contumely." The other day a brilliant writer, who never has any vitriol in his pen, stated that the Civil Service Federation represented neither labour nor capital. That is a good quip, and I enjoyed it, but nevertheless there is a tragedy in it—the tragedy of inefficiency due to those conditions which I began to narrate to you when the Chairman thought I had sufficiently done so.

Allow me to mention three exemples of the need of the right to appeal. During the war living increased in a remarkable manner, but the Civil Service had no recognition of that increase until 1918. For four years they suffered, and they contributed, thinking that they were contributing to the war. In 1918 the situation became intolerable, and they applied for a bonus. By that time the bonus had gathered volume from year to year, and you will agree with me that in four years there was considerable increase due to them on account of the increased cost of living. In that year the Government gave us a bonus, but it represented only between 8 and 9 per cent of the salaries of that year, notwithstanding the previous increases in expenses. This year, after another year of increased cost of living, we are getting between 12 and 15 per cent bonus.

Another great necessity for an Appeal Board is in the matter of promotions. In every industrial concern in this world you have patronage, that is to say, personal patronage; temperamental preference is given to certain of those whom we like, and bring into our offices. That is human nature, and we have no fault to find with it. We have that also in the Civil Service, but in addition we have political patronage. By law this political patronage has been abolished, and we all take off our hats to the Prime Minister for what he has done as the author of that great ethical act which has brought into our public service in Canada some semblance of merit, nevertheless we claim that, no matter what laws are made, there is a measure of patronage in the Service, and we ought to have the right to appeal from undue patronage given to Civil Servants for political services.

The third point on which we would desire a Court of Appeal is in regard to the abolition of the patronage system in the purchase of supplies. The Prime Minister has promised that that will be done in connection with the installation of a merit system, and I believe he will do it if he gets the backing of such an organization as this, though in the meantime he has not been able to do it. The Prime Minister has said that this system is pernicious, but Canada and Co., Unlimited, have to administer this pernicious system by which business people of one little group, perhaps 25 per cent of the whole number, are told that they shall get all the business of the Government, while the others have no right to put in a claim for it.

I have material enough to occupy three or four hours, but I presume I have overstepped my time, so I will stop.

Mr. J. E. MORASH (Halifax): In rising to support the resolution proposed by the labour side of this House, I feel that I must do so as one of the Commissioners. It is inconceivable to those on this side that the Government of Canada should decline to give the same consideration and conditions to its employees as it is recommending other employers to put into operation. Yet we find to-day a great inequality, as between the employees of the Government and those of other concerns, as regards payment for the same class of service. It appears to some of us that if it is proper for this conference to consider and recommend a minimum wages for the workers of other employers, surely it is proper that a minimum and adequate wage should be put into effect for the employees of the Government. Not only should government employees be on an equality with those outside the Service, but we claim that the Government should be a model employer, and should set standards in its treatment of employees which other employers should be asked to adopt. Even if you call the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations an experiment, it occurs to me that while the Governments of this country are spending thousands upon thousands of dollars year after year in experimenting as to how to grow hogs and corn and wheat and other things, they might well try the experiment of establish-

ing industrial councils and carrying out the other recommendations of the Royal Commission. We can conceive of no logical reason why employers should hesitate to recommend that the Government pay to workers the same rates that those employers must pay for the same class of service. Government services are not generally performed on a political basis, and consequently we on this side say that the Government should be willing to set a standard giving their employees consideration by way of appeal boards or tribunals as well as placing them, with regard to wages, conditions and hours of service, on the same footing as other employees throughout the country who perform similar service. I sincerely hope that the Government will take seriously into consideration the recommendations made on this side of the House, and give a fair measure of treatment to its employees.

Mr. J. C. O'CONNOR (Ottawa): Having been born in this country, and my wife being Canadian born, I think I can, as a civil servant, speak on this question in a Canadian way. We have not in this country such societies as exist on the other side of the line for civil service reform—happily so, I think, for we have not the same conditions to contend with. While patronage has been an evil here, it has not been nearly as bad as it has been in the country to the south of us. In Canada, the propaganda for improving conditions in the service has been laid entirely upon the shoulders of the civil servants themselves. For long years they have contended for better conditions, not selfishly, but in the interest of the people of Canada. I think that is a matter that should be taken into consideration in connection with the recommendations that are now before the House.

I am sorry that our friends on the other side did not think it proper to put their recommendations in the form of a report, as was done on this side. It seems to me that they are altogether too modest in their opinion of what should be done in this Conference. True, it is a matter of Government policy to deal with Government employees, but it is also for Government employees to deal with labour conditions in this country, and I cannot conceive that the Government would call this Conference, invite Civil Servants here, and put on the programme an item dealing with Civil Service affairs, and then think or say that the matter might be passed over entirely as one to be referred back to the Government. There is a saying in Ottawa, which you also hear in other parts of the country, about "passing the buck." I think this is a very good sample of passing the buck; and I do not think that this Conference should let this matter go without having some opinion expressed as to the advisability of civil service reform in Canada. There are Civil Servants who are members of unions, and others who are members of associations, and still others who are unorganized. The latter are unable to express their collective opinions; as has been freely said more than once on the floor of this House, they can only express individual opinions. Organization is admitted to be a good thing, and if it is good in private employment it is good in Government employment; it offers a good method by which the Government can deal with its employees, after finding out the conditions in the Service, and learning how they should be improved. I contend that since the members of the Civil Service have been carrying on this work entirely in their own time and with their own ability, such as it is, this Conference should make some declaration in order that the matter may be properly placed before the people of the country.

There is one little item which I would like to read to you, not perhaps in quite so serious a vein as I have endeavoured to assume:

> It seemed that when Rastus and Sam died they took different routes, so when the latter got to heaven he called Rastus on the telephone.
>
> "Rastus," he said, "how yo' like it down there?"
>
> "Oh, boy! Dis am some place," replied Rastus. "All we has ter do is ter wear a red suit wid horns, an' ebery now an' den shovel some coal on de fire. We don't work no more dan two hours out of de 24 down here. But tell me, Sam, how it is wid you up yonder?"
>
> "Mah goodness! We has to git up at fo' o'clock in de mawnin' an' gathah in de stahs; den we has ter haul in de moon and hang out de sun. Den we has ter roll dde clouds aroun' all day long."
>
> "But, Sam, how comes it yo' has ter work so hard?"
>
> "Well, to tell de truf, Rastus, we's kin' o' short o' help up here."

That is the position, Mr. Chairman, that the Civil Service finds itself in at the present time.

REPORT OF THIRD GROUP—FAVOUR SUGGESTIONS OF ROYAL COMMISSION.

Mr. R. R. GRANT (Toronto): As representatives of the Third Group, we have not been in entire accord with the two previous

reports submitted. We disagree with the report of the first side principally because we do not consider it goes far enough. So far as the second group are concerned, we think that the things that they recommend, as they did in Committee, were possibly a little bit farther advanced than the recommendation in the Commission Report intended. In view of these facts, and not being able to agree entirely with the finding of the other two groups, we submit the following:

The representatives of the Third Group on this Committee believe that, in so far as the findings of this Conference approve and such findings are to the benefit of the public weal, the suggestions of the Royal Commission should be put into effect in all Departments and works controlled by the Government of this country.

(Sgd.) T. D. Bouchard.
R. R. Grant.

In reference to the First Group, we appreciate that, from their point of view, they have no desire to advocate a system for public servants which might possibly react upon themselves, but we believe that public servants should be regarded as representing the ideal form of assistance to employers, and should receive the fairest possible treatment. In view of the finding of the Royal Commission approved by this Conference, it would be advisable as far as possible, to incorporate those ideas into a Board which would consider the troubles which may exist between the employees of the Government and the Government itself.

With reference to the plan advocated by the second group, we disagreed with it principally on these grounds. We consider that public servants are in a position entirely different from that of any other employees, and that if they had the same liberties and freedom as other employees, such privileges would interfere with the public weal. The point is that, where public utilities are concerned, it is absolutely essential, as all the citizens of Canada are interested, that public servants should be treated so liberally that they would have no cause for complaint. The difficulty which occurred in Toronto recently, due partly to capital and partly to labour, showed very plainly a condition of affairs which the public do not intend to tolerate. The tendency in Canada at the present time is for capital in public utility industries to belong to the public and not to private interests; and, so far as that affects the employees concerned, it is the desire of the public to treat the employees fairly and to provide sufficient Boards to hear any complaints that they may have; but under no circumstances should they have the liberty and freedom to go on strike without plenty of notice of their intention being given to the public.

Mr. E. S. WOODWARD (Victoria, B.C.): As an ex-Civil Servant may I intervene with a few brief remarks in this debate? I want to say before beginning that I was asked to make this statement on behalf of a former speaker who was unable to be here this afternoon. I am informed that there are lockmen on the Soo canal, working under the Government, who are receiving $60 a month for seven and a half months of the year and that they are dismissed for the remainder of the year—

The CHAIRMAN: May I call the attention of the speaker to the fact that during the whole course of this delight, for one week, the Convention has not permitted an individual grievance—the grievance of any individual employer or organization—to be brought up on the floor of this House, and I think it is quite improper for a gentleman who had used his time, and more than his time, before this Convention to attempt to introduce a matter of that kind through another speaker. Furthermore, there are ways and means whereby such conditions can be brought to the attention of the Government if they exist—which I think is doubtful.

Inasmuch as there is an other member of the Government present to speak a word with reference to the relations between the Government and the Civil Servants, perhaps the Conference will pardon the Chair for making a few brief remarks on the subject. Gentlemen here present representing the various labour organizations in Canada have presented several motions.

Mr. WOODWARD: Am I to understand that I am denied the floor?

The CHAIRMAN: No. When I am through you may have the floor.

One of those motions is for a general 8-hour day; another is for the right to organize and the right of recognition and the right of appeal. Applying those things to the Civil Service of Canada, may I briefly point out that there has never been any question as to the right of the Civil Servants to organize amongst themselves, and no Government in Canada that I know of has ever objected to that, though in some other countries it is not permitted.

In reference to the 8-hour day, it is a well-known fact that, in the Inside Service in Ottawa at least, the Civil Servants do not work even an 8-hour day. The average for the year, I think, would probably be less

than seven hours a day. There may be Civil Servants engaged on some canal work such as that of the Trent canal, whose duty it may be to turn bridge or open a lock two or three times a week or sometimes less, and as to whom the condition just referred to may prevail. I cannot say definitely. But for such cases to be brought before a Conference of this sort as indicating the situation affecting the whole Civil Service is, I submit, ladies and gentlemen, not representative of the facts on the average.

Mr. Grierson, the introducer of the Committee's report from the side of the employees, spoke with fitting appreciation of the fact that patronage had been abolished in the Civil Service by law. Not only has it been abolished in the Civil Service by law, but it has been absolutely abolished so far as practice is concerned, to my own knowledge. I know that at the present time the Department of Labour is advertising for three officials, one to be the Director of Technical Education under the legislation recently passed, and two in connection with the employment service. The Department cannot go out and engage those officials; it has no say whatever in their selection. The candidates make their applications and then submit their recommendations, and the Civil Service Commission is the sole judge as to who is the most competent and best qualified applicant. The Department must accept whomsoever the Civil Service Commission appoints, provided his services are found to be satisfactory after a period of probation. I submit, ladies and gentlemen, that the Civil Service Commission stands between the Government and the Civil Servants in the same relations as does a Board of Conciliation between the ordinary employer and his employees when any matter in dispute requires reference to an independent tribunal, and the Civil Service Commission is standing in that relation as between the Government and its Civil Servants at the present time. In addition to that, upon the request of the Civil Service, within a year past the Government did appoint a particular minister to whom they could take matters in appeal when the decision of the Civil Service Commission itself was not to their satisfaction or not acceptable.

I therefore quite agree with the recommendation that has been made by the first Committee, that the relations of the Civil Servants to the Government are not quite the same as the relations between private employers and employees, because the employer is operating his industry or plant in the hope of obtaining profit, whereas the Government of course is not doing so.

Furthermore, with reference to compensation, I think it would be found, if an investigation were made—and one has been made, but has not been made public—the average Civil Servant does receive compensation equivalent to that of the average workers throughout the country; and the increased compensation which the Government granted to its Servants within the past two years aggregated more than $13,000,000 annually. It may be that the Government has not gone as far as it ought, but I submit to you, ladies and gentlemen, that the Civil Servants have not been neglected from above, but have received careful and, I think, reasonable consideration. Nevertheless the door is open through which the Civil Service, through the minister who has been appointed for that particular purpose, may appeal to the Privy Council if necessary. They have several times appealed to the Government and have been heard willingly. There is a court of appeal, a proper channel through which the Civil Servants may appeal. There were abuses, of which they formerly and with justice complained, such as the difficulty of obtaining promotion or recognition because of the evils of patronage, which, I think, we all recognize did exist in years gone by, in every government. The abolition of such things has wrought a very distinct and beneficial service to the Government employees. I have every sympathy with the Civil Servants, as I think they will agree, is shown by my attitude towards them and my relations with them. The Government has endeavoured to treat them fairly, and I would not like the impression to go abroad from this Conference, to be spread throughout the country, that the Civil Servants had all the grievances that some of the labour men have, such as that of having to work long hours at starvation wages, and had no right to appeal and no tribunal at which they might obtain justice. That would not be a representation of the facts.

Mr. TOM MOORE: If Mr. Woodward is quite satisfied, in view of the fact that we have only 40 minutes in each case and there is another phase of the subject to introduce, I will occupy the time he was going to occupy, in closing our side of the case for the report which has been presented for the Labour Group. It is more than a question of the Civil Service. The resolution which I think was read by Mr. Grierson says:

We concur in the recommendation of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations that

the findings of the Commission should be put into effect in all works contracted by all Government bodies where the principle of democratic management can be applied.

Dealing with that, I would like to point out that there are many government bodies in addition to the Federal Government and the Inside and Outside Civil Service. There are municipalities scattered throughout this country who operates public utilities, there are provincial governments who operate, sometimes directly and sometimes through commissions, ordinary commercial undertakings, and the conditions of whose workers are identical with those of employees of private concerns. You will recollect perhaps that very recently the Ontario Hydro-Electric Commission took over some utilities which had been previously operated by a private company. Up to the time this purchase by a government body the workers had a means of appealing for the redress of any grievances. I venture to say that there are officials known as managers of public utilities who are just as sincere and just as fair and try to do just as well as ever a minister or any government did—and there is no reflexion on the minister of any government in saying that. When that transfer was made, instead of the employees being subject to the decisions of the private company's manager, they became subject to the decision of a minister of the Government, or of a member of a Government Commission. That does not change the fact that inequalities or injustices may still creep in and remain. Under the private system the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act gave the employees the right to full investigation to establish the fact of injustice. If they were able to satisfy the Board of Investigation that they were right, if they proved the justice of their claim, they were given that which they required. But when the operation of a public utility is assumed by a Government body, that right ceases and the worker is put in the position of being compelled to accept the decision of one man or more, as the case may be.

What are we asking in our resolution, therefore, is simply that all the machinery which is available for the prevention of strikes where injustices, real or imaginary, may exist—that all that machinery which operates to-day or may operate in the future whatever it may be, in the case of the ordinary company-owned utilities, should be extended so as to apply to Government servants as well. I do not see that there is anything radical in that, or anything contrary to the presentation by the members from the Third Group. He says that they realize that the public employees are on a different basis from that of ordinary workers. We realize that they are operating not for profit but for service; but that would presume the very thing that Mr. Grant said, that all these things should be right. I notice he used the word "should." But unfortunately we are not all in that sphere in which Brother O'Connor referred, where, as he said, they were pulling the clouds away, and because we are not in that sphere, all things are not always right that should be right. And if they are not right, is it fair to say to a man, "Because you have entered the public service, the injustice which you suffer shall be corrected only if you have the time and opportunity and privilege to convince one or more men, who may also be public servants, of the justice of your claim."

Let us look at the situation very locally. You have a minister dealing, we will say, with the canal situation. I take that just as a means of illustration, and not with a desire to refer to that particularly. Suppose a canal employee in the city of Ottawa, or on the St. Lawrence, or down in Nova Scotia, if there are any canals there, or a few hundred miles away, is dissatisfied with something that occurred, and a number of such employees become dissatisfied. They are not trained in legal ways; they are not always able to state their case clearly in correspondence. They write to the minister in such a way that he does not realize and grasp what the man is really suffering from, or what the group of men are suffering, and, owing to the multitude of duties he has to perform, the matter does not receive inquiry or consideration—with what result? The result that those men nurse a legitimate grievance, and every little thing which otherwise might be remedied becomes a mountain to them, until a strike takes place, and then the public say they had no right to strike. It is for the purpose of preventing strikes by means of a thorough inquiry in which the men have confidence, that we are presenting this resolution at this time.

I know that there is an obstacle in the mind of the Government bodies of this country. The obstacle is that it would be infra dig for any Government department or any Committee or Commission appointed

by them to examine into the affairs of another Government department, or the affairs of a provincial or municipal government. I know that is the principle which underlies it all. But in Britain they have risen superior to that. The British Government has said to the postal workers: "You shall have the same machinery as other employees; you shall have even the industrial councils, on which you can be represented, and we will treat you as employees are treated in a commercial undertaking." The Municipal Union of the British Isles have made a declaration that their employees shall be given all the same privileges and treated in just the same way as private employees—in fact, not in the same way, but in a way which is a little superior to that in which any private employer could possibly treat them. When that difficulty has been ovecome in Great Britain, is there any reason why in the Dominion of Canada, the Federal, provincial, civic, or any other public authorities cannot rise equal to the occasion by adopting the principles laid down in this resolution of ours, and making available all machinery which can possibly be used for inquiry and investigation, in order to remove or settle the grievances which arise in the minds of men who have to work for a living.

I therefore submit, Mr. Chairman, this resolution to go on the record, in order that public authorities may take note of it along with the remarks which have been presented, and in the hope that it will be accepted and become the law of this country.

Mr. HUGH BLAIN (Toronto): Whether rightly or wrongly, the public have the feeling that when a person once enters the employ of the Government he is safe for life, and I think we have sufficient confidence in our Government to feel that that is the case. I have never yet heard of anybody in the employ of a Government being dismissed from the service because he was becoming advanced in years. I am sure that the whole system backed up by public opinion is on a different basis and is treated in a different way and on an altogether different plane from that of the ordinary employer.

Mr. T. A. STEVENSON (Ottawa): I just want to make plain to this Convention a certain point. Committee representatives of the Third Group presented at least two propositions to this Convention to-day, and I desire to make it plain that those resolutions are not from the Third Group as a body. My reason for wanting to make that plain is this. In presenting the last report from representatives of this group, regarding the matter that is now under discussion, reference was made to Civil Servants going on strike. Let me say that it was my privilege about a year and a half ago to assist in organizing Civil Servants under a municipal government. Unfortunately for the municipality, those men have since gone on strike, and I have no regrets to offer to-day because I organized them, for the result of their organization and of their strike is that they are working under much better conditions now than they were prior to their organization.

Mr. GRIERSON: I am sure you will accord me the privilege, Mr. Chairman, of removing what I fear has been the false impression which I may have created. The compliments that we have paid to the Government of which you are a member will surely remove any idea that we are referring to the Government at present in power, a Government which has done more than any other Government in Canada for the adoption of the merit system. The bane of our whole existence is the patronage system. It was introduced in the British Isles by Julius Cæsar 2,000 years ago. I do not know what are the rights of gentlemen in this chamber, but I think I have a right to mention that historical fact. Since that time patronage has become established. It continued right down to the time of autocratic kings, and then, under representative government it became political party patronage. We are talking of an inanimate thing, but it is an unscrupulous thing, and we have to talk as we think about it; but as far as personalities and present Governments are concerned, we had no idea of making any reference whatever.

The CHAIRMAN: The recommendations of the committees, as you heard them read, will be placed upon the record.

ORGANIZATION OF LABOUR.

REPORT OF EMPLOYERS' REPRESENTATIVES—ADMIT RIGHT TO ORGANIZE, BUT OPPOSE "CLOSED SHOP" AND INDIRECT NEGOTIATION.

Mr. J. P. ANGLIN (Montreal): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen, there is an old saying that the first shall be last. In my opinion, the subject that we will now be obliged to discuss for a short time perhaps should have been first.

I beg to report on behalf of the employers' representatives on Committee No. 4 of the revised agenda, for the consideration of:

(a) employees' right to organize;
(b) recognition of labour unions;
(c) right of employees to collective bargaining;

that it has not been found possible to arrive at a unanimous decision, and it was decided that separate recommendations should be submitted.

I therefore, as Chairman of the Employers' committee members, submit the following recommendations:—

(a) Employers admit the right of employees to join any lawful organization.

(b) Employers should not be required to recognize unions or to establish "closed shops." Employers insist on the right, when so desired, to maintain their plants as "open shops," by which they mean that no employer should discriminate against any employee because of the latter's membership or non-membership in any organization, and no employee should interfere with any other employee because of the latter's membership or non-membership in any organization.

(c) Employers should not be required to negotiate, except directly, with their own employees or groups of their own employees.

(Signed) J. P. Anglin.
A. H. Weston.
D. H. McDougall.

I should have been delighted had it been possible to agree that there should be absolutely no discussion of this big subject, but I believe that it is in the best interest of the public, and possibly in the best interest of this Conference, that some statement should be made as to the main reasons for the stand which the employers have taken. I do not know much about the other committees, but our committee was certainly a good committee, and every member of that committee sincerely endeavoured to come to some solution. I am free to admit, Mr. Chairman, that it is my personal belief that, given another twenty-four hours, we should almost, if not quite, have come to a unanimous report.

The chief point of difference between us was with respect to any legislation whatsoever. I will not discuss that point, because it has not been raised by the other side; but, Mr. Chairman, we on our side endeavoured to get down to basic principles, and we believe that the main basic principle which should be borne in mind in looking at this question from both sides of the House, is the freedom of the individual in a democratic country such as ours.

I was rather pleased to see in a report of the Department of Labour on labour questions in Canada, that the first platform of the International Trades Union Organization reads as follows:—

The abolition of all forms of involuntary servitude.

That, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me is the stand which we take on this question, and should be the stand taken on the other side; because, after all, the fear that is in the minds of most employers is with regard to the closed shop. I think the majority of employers are in favour of dealing with organized labour, but no individual or group should have the right to oblige any other individual to join a particular organization, or any organization, before he is permitted to earn a livelihood. We do not require that a person entering Canada should even become a citizen before he can find employment.

With regard to the employees' right to organize, as a body of intelligent employers we do not question this right, and we believe that when organized labour itself realizes fully the changed position in which it stands to-day before the world, it will declare itself as opposed to compulsion of any kind. Then, and then only, can organized labour attain the highest ideals and the highest state of development.

As to the right of employees to collective bargaining, this whole Conference has demonstrated the sincere desire on the part of employers to ascertain the real problems of labour, with a view to aiding in their solution. Each of us has much to contribute for the other's good. Of course, in the stress of battle it is often difficult to see this.

The Report of the Royal Commission, at page 6, paragraph H, item 4, gives as among the chief causes of unrest: "denial of right to organize and refusal to recognize unions." We have declared ourselves over and over again on the first phrase, "the right to organize," as recognizing this right, but on the second phrase, "recognition of labour unions," we declare it to be inimical to the best interests of both sides to recognize one union to the exclusion of another or to the exclusion of any individual not a member of that union.

The Peace Treaty has been drawn up to give expression to the great basic principles for which we as a democratic country fought. I believe that we as employers and employees, will support it in its entirety when we fully realize its purport. Does any one think that we should accept the report of our own Royal Commission as gospel, and that if we, the employers, go

contrary to it, we commit an unpardonable sin, when the Commission itself was divided, and only one employer subscribed to it, while the report of two employers out of the three on that Commission has not been put on the agenda in any shape or form?

Look at page 6, paragraph 21. Do you find any statement there as to the basic reason for unrest? What do you need in order to have rest? Given an ample quantity of the necessities of life, a few of its luxuries, plus a bigger brotherhood, the word "unrest" would be unheard of. I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that increased production of all kinds of necessities is the main problem in the solution of the unrest in this country; and that it could be settled by our finally forgetting our petty differences and considering the wonderful things which have been accomplished for labour and for capital.

The Peace Treaty, in introducing a clause in respect to labour and the unification of conditions, has, in my opinion at least, done a great thing for the manufacturers and employers of Canada, in that it will result eventually in raising the conditions of the employed in foreign countries, so that we shall be able to compete with them more easily and on a much fairer basis. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I think that all on the other side of the House will admit that in the past capital has done a great deal for labour as a whole. It is useless to cite specific cases; but I am sure that when we look at this question in a broad way, we can see that each of us has something of value to contribute to the other, and that it is unnecessary for us to differ radically on the details.

REPORT OF EMPLOYEES' REPRESENTATIVES—RECOMMENDS GENERAL RECOGNITION OF RIGHT TO ORGANIZE, OF LABOUR UNIONS, AND OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING.

Mr. W. L. BEST (Ottawa): Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: In introducing this very important question I think I observed that it was perhaps one of the largest questions that had been presented to the Conference for consideration. I believe that the Committee—and when I speak of the Committee I include the members of both sides—have endeavoured seriously to put their best thought into the very harmonious deliberations that we have had. I feel like saying that in my opinion every member of the Committee endeavoured as far as it is humanly possible to forget any personal interest in the matter.

I had hoped although it may not have been anticipated by the most sanguine, that we might bring in a unanimous report. However, as I have already observed, the subjects contained in Item No. 4 were of such magnitude that it is perhaps not at all surprising to some that a unanimous report has not been submitted. It was therefore deemed advisable that the respective groups represented should submit separate reports.

It might be well to read the report of our Committee before making any comment upon it, because what I have to say bears directly upon one or two of the things contained in it. The report is addressed to the National Industrial Conference, and reads as follows:

To the National Industrial Conference:

The Labour Representative of your Joint Committee to whom was referred Item Number 4 of the revised agenda, viz:

Consideration of:

(a) employees' right to organize;

(b) recognition of labour unions; and

(c) the right to collective bargaining;

respectfully submit the following report, with recommendations, for your favourable consideration:

1. With a view to effecting and maintaining harmonious relations between employers and employees, this Conference declares the following principles and policies, and urges their adoption by all employers relative to their respective employees:

(a) the right of employees to organize;

(b) the recognition of labour unions;

(c) the right of employees to collective bargaining.

2. In these recommendations, without changing the generality of their terms,—

(a) "the right of employees to organize" means the right of employees to organize or form themselves into associations for lawful purposes.

(b) "the recognition of labour unions" means the right of employees, or their duly accredited representative or representatives, to recognition of their employer or employers, for the purpose of mutually arranging rules and regulations governing wages and working conditions.

(c) "the right of employees to collective bargaining" means the negotiation of agreements between employers or groups of employers and employees or groups of employees, through the representative or representatives chosen by the respective parties themselves.

Entering into agreements and bargaining collectively with an association or union of employees does not mean recognition of the "closed shop," unless the agreement so provides.

(d) "employer" or "employers," as used in clauses 1 and 2, means any employer or employers of any industry and of Federal, Provincial and Municipal Governments.

3. That the Federal and Provincial Governments be urged to enact legislation applicable to industries within their respective juridictions, to make it unlawful for any employer who shall discharge or refuse to employ or in any manner discriminate against employees merely by reason of membership in labour unions or for legitimate labour union activities outside of working hours.

What we were specifically dealing with in Item 4 of the revised agenda was, rights of employees, and I think the representatives of the employees who were assigned to this duty with the representatives of the employers had a keen sense of their responsibility when considering it from that viewpoint, and that viewpoint alone; because, going with any rights, and particularly the rights of citizenship, one must appreciate the importance of all that is involved in the word "right." We viewed the question from the viewpoint alone of the right of the employee, a citizen of Canada. In the course of our deliberations it was suggested, I think by one of our co-workers from the other group, that it might be well, when we were dealing with the recommendation, or making a declaration of policy on any one of the three subjects named in this report, that we should give an interpretation of what was meant by the terms, "the right to organize," "recognition of the union," and "the right of collective bargaining." Hence we have placed a section in our recommendation which interprets these terms as we understand them, as broadly as it is possible to do, and yet with certain limitations, I believe I am within the realm of fact when I say that the interpretations placed there are in harmony with the report of the Royal Commission and the interpretations they have placed on all those subjects.

When we placed our interpretation on the word "employer" or "employers" I did not anticipate, or have any knowledge whatever concerning the observations made here on behalf of the Civil Service of Canada. I had no conference with any of their representatives, and, although our good friend O'Connor was a member of the Committee, we did not discuss or consider this matter at all, except in regard to giving rights to civil servants the same as to any other employees. I had in mind what has been considered in a subject that has been already dealt with, that in one industry alone the Dominion Government is now controlling approximately 14,000 miles of railroad in this country. Some of the provincial governments are controlling railway mileage, in addition to all the other offices of the Civil Service, inside and outside. It was therefore believed by the representatives of the employees, in dealing with rights as we were doing, that when any citizen in Canada, whether because of economic conditions or by chance or choice, entered the service of His Majesty, he should not be denied the rights of any other citizen by so doing; and we believed that the same right should be accorded him if he chose to enter the service of a Municipal Government. In following out the specific principles being dealt with, we endeavoured to follow them logically and consistently through the three subjects contained in that item. That is why we have used the term "employer" in the broad way that we did in the definitions or interpretations of the second clause in our presentation.

I believe the mutual understanding arrived at this morning was that the matter was now to be left entirely to the Government to deal with as best they could or as they deemed expedient. I would therefore beg to move:—

That the Report submitted on behalf of the Labour Group, relative to Item No. 4 of the revised agenda, be received and recorded, and that the Government take such action in connection therewith as may be deemed most desirable, having regard to the national and industrial importance of the questions involved.

Mr. F. B. EWART (Toronto): In deference to one of my very good friends of the Third Group, it is with great trepidation I rise, but I may comfort him by saying that I do not intend to bring in a report. I am speaking as an individual who is entirely neutral on this Committee. My chief object is to bear testimony to the harmonious relations that existed in the Committee. Both sides displayed a sincere desire to understand and appreciate the attitude of the other. While many points advanced could not be fairly conceded by the opposition, there was an evident desire to frankly admit their force within certain limits. The discussion, therefore, made it evident to me that there is more common ground in this matter than can be easily disclosed. Unfortunately, the whole question is so complicated that the common ground is interwoven between the high points of difference, and can not be readily separated in such a short time.

I have no apology to offer for the failure of the Third Group representatives to evolve an alternative recommendation. The whole question at issue has been a bone of contention for generations. The discussion on the floor of this Conference did not seem to point very directly to a solution. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the failure of the contending parties to reach a unanimous verdict in committee the neutral representatives should have lacked a divine inspiration.

I wish to say, in closing, that my experience on this committee has convinced me

that these differences may be composed in the near future by patience, and solely by appeal to reason, and without resort to force.

Dr. D. STRACHAN: In looking back over the Conference I do not recall a word I have said that I wish to be deleted from the record of the Conference. On the other hand, in looking back over what little part I have taken in it, I find that I have to crave the indulgence of the Conference by asking that some words should be put in that I left out. This morning my colleague Mr. Moore and I tried to be as felicitous as we could in according to you, Sir, and to others who were included in the vote of thanks the appreciation of this Conference for your work and your attendance. We did right to say something about the part that you took in the Conference; and, while we do not take back a single word we said about you, I find—and I am sure Mr. Moore will be of the same mind—that we have made a very serious omission. We were all conscious through the week, and through the 12 hours of each day of the week, that much of the success of this Conference has depended upon the splendid work that has been done by your Deputy, Mr. Gerald Brown.

DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Dr. STRACHAN: I have often felt very sorry for Deputy Ministers. I often thought I would like to write a monograph on Deputy Ministers. They have to be always on hand, they dare not obtrude themselves; they have no particular authority; they have to be the goat between the Minister and the public; and if that includes all the work, I am perfectly certain that it is the mind of the Conference that Mr. Gerald Brown has been a magnificient success. I just wish, with my friend Mr. Moore, to include Mr. Brown in that vote of thanks.

I was asked to say a word or two in connection with the matter that is now before the House, particularly that of recognition of the Union and Collective Bargaining. It may be a matter of regret that we have not been able to see eye to eye in this matter, but I believe we all feel the seriousness of the position we occupy here. We are not here as individuals, but in a representative capacity. One or two matters came up in which I would have been perfectly satisfied to go possibly a little further than we were able to go, and I did not go that far because I felt that I was representing not only myself, and not only my company, but also a great deal more—that I was here as a citizen of Canada trying to work out in the best possible way a policy that would be for the best interests of the future of this country.

With regard to the 8-hour day, I have no doubt that there were many men on that side who, if they were here simply as individuals, would have gone farther than they have gone.

EMPLOYEES' DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Dr. STRACHAN: I am perfectly certain of that, but I am sure that you were serious too, and that you were not here representing your own individual views, broad as they may be, but you were representing a whole host of men behind you who were looking for guidance and leadership, and that some of them were conservatives, and that some of them were of the other side.

There is another thing I want to say: that there were a great many things that we did not say that we might have said, and I thank God that we did not say them. This was not a Conference for reprisals. It would have been a simple matter for somebody on that side of the House or somebody on this side to fling across the House some individuals phrase that meant tragedy, and that was mean, and that should not have been said. I could have told you, I could now tell you, scores of things if I wanted to—things that have been done that have turned faith into suspicion; but it was not my business to do that. We could easily tell things that have been done that were wrong. You know of lots of things that the employers of labour have been responsible for individual things that, taken out of their environment and obtruded upon this Conference, would have looked ugly and bad. But this was not the place for that kind of thing. I am perfectly sure that on both sides we have purposely and deliberately refrained from tossing things backwards and forwards on the floor of this House that would have meant acute feeling and that would have sent us away with madness and dislike on our hearts. In looking back over the past week I am more than thankful that we took the larger view and that we did not indulge in that kind of thing.

On the other hand, there are scores of things that the men on this side of the House in their work and their industry have done, and perhaps no notice is taken of them, and perhaps they are not getting credit for them. I could assure you that the attitude between employers and labour is not one of malice, not one of a military nature; we are not looking at the men that are round about us as our enemies; we are looking upon them as our friends. Here is a sample. I was asked by somebody,

"Why don't you tell some of the things that your company has done without being asked to do them?" We put the 8-hour day into effect on the 1st day of March without being asked to do it. On the 1st day of June we raised the scale of wages; and every man who works for the Imperial Oil Company can feel sure that nothing need happen him until the day of his death, that he is going to be taken care of, and that when he cannot do his work the Company will be responsible for his care. We have this, that where a man does——

A DELEGATE: Mr. Chairman, I would ask you whether we are discussing collective bargaining or the Imperial Oil Company?

Dr. STRACHAN: I was going to say this. Is that a bad thing? Is that a wrong thing? It is only to show that the attitude of one side to the other is not an attitude of animosity; it is an attitude of the opposite kind.

Now, coming to the main question, a recognition of the union, I want to say that the reason we hesitate in going any farther in the direction that we have gone is that we feel we have no right to be a party to anything that will interfere with the British-born right of any man to freedom of contract. We believe that in the distance we have gone we have given every right, every privilege, and we hesitate to go any farther if it will take away from any man in this country the right to work or not to work, to belong to any union or not to belong to any union. That is the reason we have taken the position we did.

Mr. A. C. HAY (Winnipeg): Mr. Chairman and workers,—I am delighted to find that some of the employers on the other side have begun to recognise that there is labour in this country. Some of them particularly did not bother about labour. You will pardon me if I say that we bother about labour. We look after the human part of the machine that you use in the production of your commodities. I find that you have always this opinion, that a labour union is a fighting machine built up for the purpose of fighting the employer. I want to disabuse your minds of that idea. A labour union is not a fighting machine—far from it. Once the employers concede union recognition and the right of collective bargaining and deal with their employees as their employees are willing to deal with them, there is no strife.

I do not want to elaborate this question at too great length. I will just select one union as to which I have complete figures. As you are aware, I did take exception to some figures, but these are correct, and I will not apologize for them. This is what was done with the union funds last year. The sum of $[illegible] was paid by our organization to old age pensions to their members. A very good thing, isn't it? You do not give anything like that to your employees. The sum of $[illegible] was paid in sanitary benefits to the members of their organization and $[illegible] was paid for the maintenance and improvement of a home they have for their old age pensioners. Now, here is where the fighting comes in—pay particular attention. They spent $1,337 in strike benefits to the members of that organization last year. If that does not disprove the statement that unions are fighting machines, I do not know what better proof there could be. Those figures which I have quoted are authentic.

Then, again, I find the employers are always talking about their suspicion. I think the suspicion is entirely across the floor. I have in my hand the report of a provisional joint committee of the Industrial Conference of Great Britain. It is dated, Westminster, April 4th. Turning to page 14, I find:

> Recognition of, and negotiation between, organizations of employers and work-people.
>
> (a) Basis of negotiation between employers and work-people should be full and frank acceptance of employers' organizations and trade unions as the recognized organizations to assess and act on behalf of their members.

We are a very advanced country, and yet Britain has got ahead of us in that respect. The people in Britain think it is about time they were recognizing the trade unions as speaking for the labour men of that country.

I heard something said this morning about the freedom of mankind, and all the rest of it, but I notice that special emphasis is placed on the fact that this freedom is for the organized workers. In a community we all pay taxes, even the old bachelor or old spinster, for the education of the family of the man next door. We have all to do something along that line. There are some things in this world which we must do. We have to take an interest in the community and also to pay taxes. Now, I do not see why a neighbour of mine should claim that he has a right to educate my children, if he has none of his own, but still he has to fulfil his duty as a citizen.

Another remark I heard from the other side of the House was that we must do our full duty as citizens to the best of our ability. I think one of the duties of citizen-

ship is to try to get a broad-minded understanding of labour conditions, and not to confine your attention to one class of the community or take an antagonistic stand against labour, thinking in dollars and cents. The man who thinks in dollars and cents never thinks of the human being. That little human touch is what is required. You men have the education, we know, or you would not succeed in business. We do not by any means say you have not the intelligence, but we claim you have not studied the labour movement, we claim you do not make a study of your workers as you ought to do. I would like to go on record as trying to do something, not for the labour movement, or for myself as an individual, but for every one in Canada, and if I might suggest something at this Conference it would be that the employers try to study the human aspect a little more.

Some DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

Mr HAY: Now, regarding the recognition of trade unions, I hear from the opposition side of this House that the reason why you will not recognize unions is because of their lack of strength. My reason for quoting the figures which I have presented was, as I say, to disabuse your minds of the idea that labour unions are fighting machines. I think that if the employers studied labour organizations and assisted them to maintain order in this country we would not suffer from so much industrial unrest. There are always two parties to a bargain, but still labour gets the blame for not controlling the workers. It is never said that the employers are to blame. No, we do not control the workers except when trouble breaks out, and then we get no support in some cases. I do not say all cases; I am broadminded in that respect. I think that if the employers would organize and would adopt a constitution and live up to it, then the labour man in Canada would enjoy better times.

Freedom is a relative term, and I would like freedom and justice to apply to all the workers in Canada. You claim you want to grant everything to the unorganized workers. That seems strange to an organized worker, that you are particularly interested in those who are unorganized and are claiming everything for them. Why should you be so particularly interested in the unorganized worker? I think that exposes a mercenary motive that you would not take so much interest in the unorganized worker if you could not get him to work more cheaply than the organized worker. In other words, you are talking again in dollars in cents. That is your "freedom."

The British employers are as much imbued with the idea of British justice as are any Canadian employers, we all admit that. Yet the British employers have gone a little farther, and have recognized trades unions.

This being the first Industrial Conference that has been called in Canada, I am taking for granted that the labour men came here with a knowledge of the issues, and the other side, while intelligent in business, were not conversant with labour questions. I think we have accomplished something in this respect. The Committee members on this side of the House have met with members from the other side and have placed the case before them, and I believe we have got more closely together. I look for more harmonious relations between employers and employees as a result of this Conference, and if we get only that, as labour is not selfish or greedy, we shall be quite content. Nevertheless we have not accomplished our purpose. We have a great ideal and a great programme before us. The two most contentious questions that interest the Labour group on this side of the House are the 8-hour day and the recognition of labour unions and the right of collective bargaining, and we think that until we have obtained those things we have not accomplished the ideals of labour for 1919. Our aspirations will go a little further in 1920.

Now, coming back to the recognition of trades unions, I have spoken to employers, and they have stated to me that they would recognize the union; that they had always done business with the union and always found they were getting closer together with their employees; and that many of their imaginary grievances were cleared away by mutual understanding.

When we leave our home town the radical element tell us: "You international officers are on trial; if you can accomplish nothing, then you give us food for propaganda." They may say to us: "You went down there and smoked Government cigars and talked for a week, but you accomplished nothing." Here is the position, as I see it. They will say: "The employers will not concede you this, and they will not concede you that. It all comes back to our argument, that international unions cannot obtain anything; the only way to get anything is

through direct action." That is a thing to which the Internationalists are opposed. We would ask your support in this respect. If you are in earnest and sincere you ought to grant recognition of the orthodox trade unions. Let me tell you that the Chairman of this Conference was a highly respected member of a trade union, and there are others, friends of the Chairman, who are also recognized as gentlemen, and who are labour officers. If there are highly respectable men at the top in our organizations, there is no reason in the world for any fear existing in the minds of the employers. We have in our organizations men of honour, who when they sign their name to a contract will see that no stone is left unturned to prevent that contract from being violated. If it is violated, if some radical member oversteps the mark or makes a mistake, it is through no fault of theirs.

The CHAIRMAN called time.

Mr. HAY: Is my time up? In conclusion, I would like to thank the gentlemen on the other side of the House for their careful consideration of labour's grievances and troubles, and I hope that the next time we meet we may be in the same happy frame of mind and that we shall have advanced labour in Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: The time allotted for debate on each side by the decision of the Conference this morning was within a minute or two of having expired when the last speaker rose, but I thought it was only proper that he should have an opportunity to speak at reasonable length. I think I shall have to suggest that the rule agreed to be abided by and that the debate on this subject be now closed.

Mr. C. McCUTCHEON: Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I wish to ask the Chairman of the Employers' Committee about that part of their report which reads:

> Employers should not be required to negotiate except directly with their own employees or groups of their own employees.

I shall have to make a short statement to make my question intelligible. Suppose have a more efficient spokesman, they would pay one of their number to devote his whole time to looking after their interests, would you consider that in dealing with him you would be doing business with your own employees? Or are you going to insist on doing business each time with a man who works at the bench? Is that what you mean? Or just what do you mean in that portion of your report?

Mr. J. P. ANGLIN: Mr. Chairman, that is a specific case, and as I do not sponsor a plank, and am in fact operating a closed shop and dealing with trades unions, I am not in a position to answer that question. But while I would not like to try to answer for the owners of plants, I think it may be in order for me simply to give a definition of collective bargaining which was the basis of the discussions in our committee, as it may be of some benefit to those who have been asking what collective bargaining really is. We do not think that this is a final definition, however, and this is not coming as from the employers. Collective bargaining is the negotiating of agreements between an employer and a particular group of his employees, or between employers or groups of employers and employees or groups of employees, or between the representatives of the organizations of the respective parties.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other Committees to report?

THE HOUSING PROBLEM

RESOLUTIONS CONSIDERING GOVERNMENT ACTION

Major M. A. McINNES (Saskatoon): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is very fitting that the Committee now coming last in the agenda should be the last to report. At the continued sitting of the Committee a number of resolutions came before us, and I wish to commend those who submitted those resolutions for the subject-matters therein contained and their splendid objects. As I said yesterday, I know that at the proper time and in the proper place these resolutions will come to public attention. However, we felt that the time was late and that at this hour it was not to the interest of the Conference that we should not bring in any resolutions that would tend to lengthen the session. However, there was one resolution on the lines of section W of the Report of the Royal Commission, which you referred to us and with which we felt we ought to deal. I will therefore read to you, without any further discussion by myself, the Report of the Committee. We have tried to word it in such a way that it would be unanimously accepted by both sides of the House.

> Supplementary Report Committee No. 3. Your Committee has considered section 44 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Industrial Relations, with reference to "Insufficiency and Poor Housing," and begs to submit

the Resolution offered to the Conference, as follows:

That this Conference commends the action of the Dominion and Provincial Governments in their united efforts to improve housing conditions and to provide facilities for the proper and satisfactory housing of our people, and recommends increased co-operation of, and investigation by, the Dominion and Provincial Governments to find a satisfactory solution of the problem.

W. J. Bulman,
E. G. Henderson, } For employers.
E. J. Davis
M. A. McInnes,
J. T. Foster, } For employees.
Geo. Smith
T. Linsay Crossley, for 3rd Group.

I have much pleasure in moving the endorsation of this report.

Mr. J. R. SHAW: I second that motion.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the supplementary report of Committee No. 9, as read by Mr. McInnes and seconded by Mr. Shaw. Are you ready for the question?

Mr. HUGH BLAIN: Mr. Chairman, before saying anything on this, I would like to join with the representatives of the manufacturers and the representatives of labour, myself representing the commercial interests, embracing great distributing interest of this country, in the vote of thanks that has been tendered to yourself, to the provincial ministers, to the members of the Royal Commission, and to the press. I think, Sir, that we may congratulate ourselves upon our Chairman. He has been thoroughly impartial, and to the dignity and impartiality of the Chair the whole tone of this Conference is due.

With reference to this resolution, Sir, I believe that provision was made for introducing before this Conference any subject immediately affecting the employers or the employees, and I have been all day long trying to get before the Conference a resolution on the high cost of living. I have felt that if the members of this Conference spend a whole week in Ottawa discussing the great public questions and then go away without having considered the high cost of living, there may be great discontent and dissatisfaction amongst the people of this country. I do not know, sir, that at this hour I might dare to trespass on the time of the Conference, but I wish to make this announcement in justice to myself, because this is the only question on which the distributing interests of this country, represented here, could offer valuable information or advice. This is the only question which we felt ourselves properly qualified to discuss in this Conference. As a result, I have kept my seat during the whole week, hoping that I might have an opportunity of discussing this question. I want to put myself right so that my constituents may know that I did not fail to present my case to the Conference. Mr. Trowern and his staff prepared a brief to submit to this Conference, and I regret that the Conthis Conference, and I regret that the pressure of business has been such that I have not been able to present it.

Speaking to the resolution now before us, I think we all cordially concur in it. Anything that will improve the character or the condition of our people to have the absolute and unanimous support of every member of this Conference. I have great pleasure in supporting the resolution.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

CLOSE OF THE CONFERENCE.

ADDRESSES BY THE PREMIERS OF ONTARIO AND MANITOBA, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SASKATCHEWAN, AND OTHERS.

The CHAIRMAN: May the Chair announce for the information of those present that the copies of Hansard of to-day's session will of course not be available until Monday morning, but that they will be forwarded to your respective addresses, which the Secretary may have, or to any other address which you may give him, and that a complete set of the proceedings bound in some form will be sent in due course so that you may have a complete record of what was done at the Conference.

Mr. JAMES H. ASHDOWN (Winnipeg): Mr. Chairman, before the Conference adjourns I wish to say a few words. I came here, like my friend Mr. Blain, representing the wholesalers of this country. The number of representatives given to them originally was only two. That was subsequently increased to three; but in my opinion that number does not in fair manner represent the business that we are doing or the interest that we should take in such an organization as this. We have heard of producers and consumers, but we have heard nothing of the middleman, the man who is so necessary in gathering together supplies from almost every country in the world and distributing them to the retail merchants, whose membership is also very large, and who have not had a fair representation. In spite of these facts, I have taken a very great deal of interest in what has taken place here. I have been glad to see the way in which things were dealt with on both sides of the House. I have

derived greater pleasure from the harmonious way this Conference has been conducted because of the fact that only three short months ago in the city of Winnipeg we were in the midst of a turmoil which did not end in actions as smooth as we have had here.

I was sorry to hear any expression here in regard to strikes. I think the strike is the most barbarous way in which we could go about settling our differences; and I think a great deal of credit is due to the gentleman who brought about this Conference of labourers, and those who have been called capitalists in order that they might talk this matter over. I feel that we have all been benefited by the Conference.

I do not like the bogeyes that are sometimes given to employers by employees; I do not think they are at all necessary. They arise to a large extent from misunderstanding. The lady who spoke the other day of a deathbed repentance did so, I am satisfied, from a thorough misapprehension of the facts. In looking around me, I do not see a single individual who, I believe, would be otherwise than most sympathetic in regard to the fixing of the hours of labour and the price of labour for both women and children. On the contrary, I am satisfied that the great majority of the employers are anxious to see women and children put upon a proper basis. You can understand, if you consider for a moment, that it is in the interest of employers that if one employer goes wrong in that respect he should be exposed. The others do not want to be subjected to his competition. The lady in question mentioned an instance in the city of Ottawa, and the language used in one of the newspapers with reference to it, expressed the same thought that was in my mind, namely, that it was a great pity that the name of the person who was said to have acted so wrongly should not have been given, so that the public might administer proper punishment.

As I have already said, I think the Conference has done a great deal of good, and I feel, that while the labour element did not perhaps get all that they hoped to get, and tried to get, they have got more than they expected. They have made a great step forward; and, in view of the fact, stated by the Chairman, that some 47 per cent of the labouring element has now a 44-hour week, I think they may look forward confidently to the future. Their efforts will be more effective if they go about accomplishing their desires in some other way than by making threats or talking of strikes. I believe that in at least nine cases out of ten, differences can be settled by meeting around a table in the same way that we have met here.

There is one thing, Mr. Chairman, that I think should be looked to carefully and thoroughly in connection with any legislation that is put on the statute books in the future, and that is that no sympathetic strike should be allowed in the Dominion of Canada. We all know of the awful condition of the city of Winnipeg, when the whole community was upset because of the disagreement of a very few individuals. It should also be arranged, in whatever manner may seem fit to the Government, that there should be no strikes in public utilities.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman is sorry to have to call the speaker to attention, but the debate on the subjects before the Conference have been disposed of.

Mr. ASHDOWN: I have been somewhat restricted in expressing myself because of the nature of the questions which came before us, and that is why I wished to say a few words now.

One matter that I think has not been sufficiently considered is the position of the community. That is the thought that I had in mind when speaking of sympathetic strikes and strikes in public utilities. I may say that in the early part of July I received newspapers from Saskatoon, only a day's journey distant, between two and three months after the date of their issue. If that was not an outrage on the community, I do not know what is.

Mr. E. S. WOODWARD (Victoria): I understand that our friend, on behalf of the wholesale and retail merchants of the Dominion, has offered to meet us in open conference to settle our differences. I shall be glad to accept that offer.

Mr. T. R. DEACON (Winnipeg): I am not going to discuss any of the matters that have been under debate, Mr. Chairman, and I shall not occupy more than five or six minutes—about seventy-eight dollars worth of the time of the Conference, estimated at the rate of $13 a minute.

No representative of the manufacturers of the city of Winnipeg has spoken during the entire Conference. Mr. Ashdown represents the wholesale and retail interests, but nobody has spoken on our behalf.

I wish simply to say that personally I am very much pleased with the results that have been obtained from this Conference. Perhaps our friends on the other side have

not obtained all that they hoped for from the Conference, and perhaps the men on this side have not had things entirely as they wished; but, considering the wide divergence of views with which the Conference opened on Monday morning, I think the Conference, the labour men, the employers, and the country at large are to be congratulated on the very valuable results that will flow from this meeting.

I rose particularly to express the hope, which I apply to myself primarily, and to all who took part in this Conference, that we shall not go out and forget all the good things that have been said and all the noble sentiments that have been expressed, but will proceed, each individual in his personal capacity, to put them into practice to the fullest extent within his ability.

There is no use in repeating what has been said so often, that a difference of standpoint naturally makes a difference in conclusion. The employee does not know the manager's difficulties and troubles; and they are multitudinous; on the other hand, while it may be regrettable it is nowaday quite possible that the man handling the business should know intimately the troubles and difficulties and domestic affairs of his fellow-workers in the plant which he administers. But we are all human, and all brothers, and there is no great distinction between us in our fundamental characteristics as is quite evident when we get together and talk things over.

I think a great deal of good has been accomplished by this Conference. Many resolutions have been put through which will be eventually crystallized into legislation or into practice; and while the wishes of some may not be accomplished as quickly as they may desire, we are all tending in the right direction.

I think we can also congratulate the Chairman on the fair and impartial manner in which he has presided over this Conference during the week.

Mr. TOM MOORE (Ottawa): Mr. Chairman, this afternoon Dr. Strachan, whilst replying to a question in the debate, drew attention to the fact that in the moving and the seconding of the vote of thanks earlier in the day we had omitted to express our appreciation of the work of Mr. Gerald Brown, who has acted not only as Secretary of this Conference, but in the preliminary arrangements. I think Dr. Strachan made one slight error when he referred to Mr. Brown as Deputy Minister. However, that is only a detail. I rise at this time to add that it is with great pleasure that we include Mr. Gerald Brown amongst those who were mentioned in the previous resolution. The information which he was able to tabulate and send ahead as to this Conference has, I am sure, been of great value. The study and work which he has given have contributed in a large degree toward making it a success, and the amiability with which he has met the many calls made upon him has assisted the delegates very much in carrying out their duties. I have therefore pleasure in seconding that portion of the motion.

In winding up, I am not going to say very many words. We can all pay compliments at times; but it seems to me that there is a little bad in the best of us, there is much good in the worst of us, and therefore very little difference between any of us.

Mr. C. H. CARLISLE (Toronto): Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me, I should like to speak for just a moment on a subject which perhaps is not related to the subjects that have been discussed. I have purposely remained out of the discussion, because I wanted to learn rather than to give advice.

During the time that I have been in this Conference one thing I have not heard brought out is the national aspect. We are no better than the nation permits us to be. Labour and capital are two great factors in any nation. The higher the standards of the nation, the higher the standards of labour, the higher the standards of capital.

I just want to leave something with you to think over. We have an immense national debt. Perhaps we have greater resources than most of the nations that have been engaged in the war just past; but this is a personal debt, and is a matter that should receive individual attention.

There is another thing to which I would call your attention, and that is the fact that our money is at a discount in the United States. The pound sterling is also at perhaps the lowest discount in the history of the English nation. These are things to be corrected if we want to get back on a good, sound, healthy basis.

There are two factors that will go a long way in correcting this condition: capital and labour; and it seems to me that if we are to get any concentrated effort, or purpose, or good, out of this Conference, we must see that capital and labour bring about the greatest production of which they are capable, both from our natural resources and from our factories.

There are certain things which we know from economic law: labour must have

shelter, it must have clothing, and it must have food. That is the least that it can get along with. Capital must have enough to maintain itself, or it will be depleted, and then you will not have capital. Anything we gain in the way of production is by the united efforts of capital—in the way of bargaining—and labour in the way of production. What you make beyond the mere necessities of both capital and labour is profit. Out of that profit labour must share and capital must share. Now, is it not to our interest from a national standpoint, regardless of what the controversies may be between capital and labour, to produce in the most efficient way, to market in the most efficient way, to consume mainly the products of our own country, and to put ourselves in such a position that we can get the greatest share of international trade? The greater our export business, the greater the opportunity of capital and the greater the opportunity of labour. When we go away we should keep in mind the idea that capital and labour should work together from the highest standpoint of citizenship, so that we may put ourselves in a position to meet any competition, so that we may have the best and do the best. It seems to me that should the common purpose of capital and labour, and that all the minor things that come and go in business, although sometimes very irritating, do not amount to much in the great factors of a nation's life.

Hr. HUGH BLAIN (Toronto): Premier Hearst.

Sir WILLIAM HEARST (Premier of Ontario): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, at this late hour of the Conference, I shall keep you for but a moment. I appreciate your kindness in calling upon me at this time.

I desire in the first place to thank the mover and the seconder for their words of commendation with reference to the provincial representatives at this gathering. I assure you all that it has been a great privilege for us to have had the opportunity of listening to the discussions on the many important questions that have come before you. It has been my privilege to attend many gatherings, many congresses, but I do not know that it has ever been my privilege to attend one at which there was a higher plane of debate, or in which the subjects were discussed with greater ability and greater knowledge.

When I listened to the able way in which the arguments were presented from both sides of the House I thought how happy we were in this country to have men and women so capable of giving expression to views on important questions in a congress such as this. It indicates the character of the citizens of this country. Having regard to that fact, it appeared to me that there were no problems that we could not settle in the proper way. We have one aim, one object—greater production, a greater and better Canada, and better living conditions for every part of the country. Remembering this and the ability of our people, there is surely no reason why this may not be accomplished.

It has been a great delight to me to observe the spirit of co-operation and sympathy displayed on both sides of the House during the last five days. We who sat in No Man's Land felt in the early part of the congress that the air was charged with electricity, and we did not know at what moment a high explosive shell might burst in our midst, but as hours passed away and men and women of sincerity and broad views and high ideals on the one side looked into the faces of those on the other side with broad views and high ideals and earnestness of purpose, suspicion and distrust gave place to confidence, and opposition made way for co-operation. Who could sit long and look into the genial face of the whole-souled Tom Moore and entertain feelings of distrust and antagonism? Or who could look into the face of the genial Chesterfield of the employers' group, Mr. Mines Grier, and not be attracted by his winning smile? And so, as the hours passed away, distrust and suspicion and antagonism disappeared, and at earnest desire manifested itself to help the brethren to see how near we could come together, and how much could be done for the common good and for the people of this great Dominion of Canada.

It was scarcely to be expected that on any of the resolutions coming before the Committee absolute unanimity of purpose and thought would be reached; but the greatest has been bridged between the parties, and I think it is safe to say that there is a better understanding between employer and employee in Canada to-day than perhaps there has been for a long time past.

I believe that this Conference has served a very great purpose, and has been of such benefit already as to demand others. I am convinced that it is of the greater value on account of what it holds out to be accomplished in the future. We are thinking of reconstruction. We talk of this as a period

of reconstruction; but it should also be a period of creation. We do not want to reconstruct the world as it was before the war; we want to construct a better world than ever we had before—a world where nobler ideals will prevail, a world from which as far as possible ignorance and vice shall be banished, a world in which we will all try to work for the benefit of humanity in general, and for the upbuilding of this country on the highest and best possible plane.

Mr. Chairman, it would be altogether out of place for me to take any time this afternoon, and I would not dare to enter the discussion on the subjects that have come before us. I only want to say this, that it will be the aim and object of my Government, as I know it will be of all other provincial Governments, to co-operate with the Dominion Government and with the different organizations that have been suggested by this Conference in order that the very best results may be obtained from the suggestions that have been made by the different committees. It is not the time for us to consider so particularly what belongs to another, but to try to work hand in hand for the accomplishment of the great purposes we have in mind and the development of this country of which we are so proud. I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I will now ask Hon. Mr. Norris, Premier of Manitoba, to speak.

Hon. T. C. NORRIS: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and gentlemen: I suppose I am a member of the Conference, although the squad to which I belong has not been designated. We have occupied No Man's Land, as Sir William Hearst has said, and to me one of the pleasant points of the Conference is that it is the first I ever attended when politicians were not necessary and were not expected to speak. That may be the reason for the success that has attended the efforts of this Conference. However, we may be called upon, within the next few months, to deliberate on some of the subjects that have been discussed here, and the privilege of having been here will place us in a much better position to deal with those matters.

The discussions here have covered many important questions, and I have enjoyed the privilege of being between the two forces and of hearing almost everything that has taken place; and now at the end of the Conference we are taking part in the benediction—probably as good a place as politicians could occupy. I can say this, that after carefully listening to everything that has been said, to the splendid sentiments that have been expressed from one side to the other across the floor, and noting the friendly feeling that has developed since the Conference opened, I feel that if such Conferences are called frequently enough there will be no strikes and there will be no labour troubles. To my mind the chief reason for past trouble is that you have never gotten so close together before.

An EMPLOYERS' DELEGATE: That's right.

Hon. Mr. NORRIS: You have never before laid the cards on the table as you have done at this Conference. You have never given your confidence to the other side as you have done at this Conference. When you go away, no matter what side you are on, you will say: "Those fellows on the other side are not such bad fellows; we did not know them"—because you got closer together and got acquainted with one another, which is one of the most valuable points gained in this Convention.

It is true that on many points you have not been able to bring in a unanimous recommendation as the result of your deliberations in Committee. That was to be anticipated; it would be a marvellous happening, a wonderful achievement, if on every question you would bring in a unanimous verdict. But you have discussed these questions closely, and you understand one another better, and you have removed many of the difficulties you have been talking about. You have probably not settled two or three of the more important ones; but at the next Conference you can start where you have now left off. This is a great forerunner of the important International Conference that is to take place in Washington in a few weeks. You will find that this Conference has been a great education to the few Canadians who will go down there, and I shall be surprised if the Canadians do not lead in many of the discussions in Washington because of the experience they have had here.

I am delighted at the result of this Conference. Probably we have not reached on either side the point we would have liked to reach; but you have made great progress in that direction—and we have been carefully observing from the centre what has happened—and you will be surprised with yourselves when you go home; you will be better acquainted, and you will understand

one another's cares and troubles much better.

The placing of the representatives of Governments in No Man's Land recalls the story of a Michigan farmer and his definition of a politician. This farmer was returning from market and overtook a traveller, a half-decent looking fellow, and he invited him up for a ride, and asked him if he was a stranger. The traveller replied that he was. The farmer asked, "Where are you going, and what is your business?" The traveller replied, "I am a professional man." That was not satisfactory to the farmer, and he inquired further, "What particular profession do you belong to?" The stranger replied, "I am a politician." "Oh, shucks," replied the farmer, "that is no profession; that is a disease." I suppose that is why we were relegated to the centre.

In taking part in the benediction, I would advise you to have as many Conferences as you can possibly have. You will come here next year with less prejudice than you have had this time, and greater results will follow every time you come. I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN: I am sure we should all like to hear a few words from the Hon. Mr. King.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING: The Conference has been so kind as to accord me the privilege of speaking on two occasions, and I should like to say only one word. This gathering has been described at different times as a Conference. One gentleman, I think it was Mr. Rowell, at the opening meeting, spoke of it as Canada's first Peace Conference. I think all those who have been here and have participated will go away feeling that this is Canada's First Industrial Parliament. I hope it will be a historic one in that way, and that gatherings such as this will be repeated from year to year in our country, for the great benefit of all concerned.

The CHAIRMAN: I will now ask the Hon. Mr. Dunning to speak.

Hon. CHARLES A. DUNNING (Saskatchewan): Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: I think I was the only one of the men at the centre table who broke silence previous to the benediction. I did undertake once in the proceedings to address a question to both sides of this House, and I noticed how very carefully both sides evaded giving me an answer. The question did, however, produce one result: I have been astonished at the number of men who have come to me since I asked that question and have told me that they had spent their boyhood days on the farm. I was simply astounded at the number of farmers in this room, and I was further astounded to find that they were not now farmers, which added an additional point to my question. I could only reach the conclusion then as now as they attained years of discretion they found that the path of industrial regulation as industrial labour was more attractive than the task of producing food on the farm. That, again, as I say, adds point to my original question.

It has been an education to the boys, ladies and gentlemen, and while harsh things are said and have been said to this Conference of politicians, I am not so thick-skinned as these two old war-horses who have just spoken, and I feel a little sensitive at the kindly joking references that are made as to the humour of the man in public life. I still think and still believe that the stream of political life, like any other stream, cannot rise higher than its source, and if the people composing the body politic of Canada do not expect honesty and fair dealing on the part of their public men, they are not likely to get it. Teachers tell me that in dealing with children at school a great part of the training, a very valuable part, is to expect great things of the child—to give the child to understand that great things, good things, noble things are expected of him or her. I believe that if instead of these peculiar or half-derisive references to men in public life, you would give all of us to understand that you honour us for what we ought to be, that you expect great things of us, it would be very much better. I feel sure that it would produce greater results, and that it would prevent that attitude of cynicism developing in the minds of public men through the conduct of the people whom they are supposed to serve.

This is a lesson, perhaps—a lecture from a man comparatively young in public life. I do not believe that Canada will be the kind of a country it ought to be until we are all politicians in the noblest and truest sense. I say that from the bottom of my heart. So long as the picture is held up to the youth of this country that politics is a discreditable business, and that only the lowest men are engaged in it, you cannot expect that Canada will become the country that we should like it to be, and that in meetings like this we say we desire it to be, as to its government.

I just wanted to get that off my chest. Every time I have an opportunity I strike

at that particular evil—I believe it to be an evil—and I trust you will take it in good part.

I appreciate very much all I have heard here, and, so far as our Government is concerned, I think our relations with the labour people of our own province have been good. We are always willing to listen to them. We do not generally promise "careful consideration." We have a habit, in Saskatchewan, of saying yes or no, as I think the delegates here will testify.

Some LABOUR DELEGATES: Hear, hear.

The CHAIRMAN: If there is nothing further to come before the Conference, may I be pardoned just for a moment to express, on behalf of the Federal Government itself, and particularly the Prime Minister, the appreciation they feel as to the successful results of this Conference. It has been successful because every person who has attended in the capacity of a delegate has shown and proven that he came here with the intention of endeavouring to do his or her part to improve our industrial life by agreement and co-operation. Without entering into detail or elaborating on the subject whatever, I desire to assure you that it has been a very great pleasure to me to have the opportunity to sit in and learn, as I think we have all learned, the lessons that have been taught us at this meeting. What I regarded as the keynote of the Premier's message to us last Monday morning was that, if we determined that our actions should be supported by open-handed justice, confidence—which is so much needed by both employers and employees at the present time—would be restored, and co-operation would necessarily follow. I am sure that the results of this Conference will be benficial, not only to employers and workmen, but to Canada as a nation; and I beg to express the hope that it may not be desirable or necessary for the Government to take the initiative in arranging for future Conferences. But no greater tribute could be paid to the success of this gathering than for the parties affected to arrange by mutual desire and agreement to hold another such Conference at some future date; and if they saw fit to invite the representatives of the Federal and Provincial Governments, I feel sure they would be glad to attend and sit in No Man's Land.

In opening this Convention it was, as we stated, with a feeling of relief because of victory won and menaces that had been avoided, and with a feeling of gratitude because of the possibilities that lay before us; and we sang our National Anthem because we entertained those feelings. I think we are all agreed that the spirit that underlies the British constitution has been the spirit that has been paramount throughout this Conference, and that it has been responsible in very large measure for the success that has been achieved. May we not therefore fittingly, in parting, again sing our National Anthem?

The delegates then rose and sang the first stanza of the National Anthem.

The CHAIRMAN: I now declare Canada's first National Industrial Peace Conference closed.

APPENDIX

Report of Commission

appointed under Order-in-Council (P. C. 679) to

enquire into

Industrial Relations in Canada

together with a

Minority Report

and

Supplementary Report

(Printed as a supplement to the LABOUR GAZETTE, July 1919.)

Royal Commission on Industrial Relations

Order-in-Council establishing Commission

Certified copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 4th April, 1919.

P. C. 670.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 22nd March, 1919, from the Chairman, Labour Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee, stating that a resolution was adopted at the meeting of the Labour Sub-Committee of the Reconstruction and Development Committee on the 19th instant, in the terms following:

The Labour Committee has been impressed by the necessity of some policy being formulated which will bring about the adoption of co-operative relations between employers and employees in the various lines of industry, as the best means of establishing a satisfactory relationship in industry throughout Canada. The Labour Committee realizes the different conditions existing in various industries, but nevertheless feels that there are certain basic principles which apply to all. The Labour Committee has itself given earnest consideration to the efforts which are being made in this and other countries for the solution of the problem of industrial relationships, and, recognizing the complexity and importance of this problem, recommends that a Royal Commission be appointed immediately to report to the Government on the following matters, namely:

1. To consider and make suggestions for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and employees.

2. To recommend means for ensuring that industrial conditions affecting relations between employers and employees shall be reviewed from time to time by those concerned, with a view to improving conditions in the future.

For the above purposes the Commission shall:

1. Make a survey and classification of existing Canadian industries.
2. Obtain information as to the character and extent of organizations already existing among bodies of employers and employees respectively.
3. Investigate available data as to the progress made by established joint industrial councils in Canada, Great Britain and the United States.

It is further recommended that the Commission shall submit a final report on the foregoing reference not later than June 1st, 1919.

The Committee concur in the foregoing recommendations and submit the same for approval.

ROBERT ROUGHEAD,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION.

The Honourable Chief Justice Mathers, of Manitoba, Chairman;

The Honourable Sumner White, a member of the Senate, and Managing Director, Montreal Gazette Publishing Company, Montreal;

Charles Harrison, M.P., Railroad Conductor, North Bay, Ont., as representatives of the public.

Mr. Carl Riordon, President, Riordon Pulp and Paper Company, Montreal, P.Q.;

Mr. F. Paust, Lumberman, Montreal, P.Q., as representatives of the employers.

Mr. T. Moore, Ottawa, President of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada;

Mr. J. W. Bruce, of Toronto, Member of the Labour Appeal Board, as representatives of the employees.

Mr. Thomas Bengough, of Toronto, who served as Secretary on the Technical Education Commission, Secretary.

Report of the Royal Commission

appointed under Order-in-Council (P. C. 670)

to enquire into Industrial Relations in Canada together with a Minority Report

To His Excellency
the Governor General-in-Council.

Sir,

The undersigned Commissioners appointed to inquire into industrial relations in Canada beg leave to report as follows:

1. By the terms of our Commission we were required: first, to consider and make suggestions for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and employees; second, to recommend means for insuring that industrial conditions affecting relations between employers and employees shall be reviewed from time to time by those concerned, with a view to improving conditions in the future.

2. For the above purpose the Commission was directed:

(1) to make a survey and classification of existing Canadian industries;
(2) to obtain information as to the character and extent of organization already existing amongst bodies of employers and employees, respectively;
(3) to investigate available data as to the progress made by Joint Industrial Councils in Canada, Great Britain and the United States.

3. We opened the inquiry at the City of Victoria, in the Province of British Columbia, on the 26th day of April last, and completed it at the City of Ottawa on the 13th day of June instant. Between those dates we held seventy sessions in twenty-eight industrial centres, extending from Victoria, B.C., to Sydney, N.S., in the course of which we examined 486 witnesses.

4. In view of the nature of our inquiry, it was decided that statements should be received without oath; and that the cross-examination of witnesses in the ordinary sense should not be permitted.

5. Our meetings were announced in advance by advertisements in papers circulating in the localities where the meetings were to be held, and all persons possessing information likely to be of value were publicly invited to attend.

6. The witnesses examined represented both employers and employees, and the public generally. Many of them represented groups, who had, in anticipation of our visit, prepared statements in writing, which were presented as the collective views and opinions of the group. In addition to these a large volume of evidence more or less pertinent was submitted in the form of written and printed pamphlets and documents. We also, wherever possible, visited and personally examined industrial plants with the object of visualizing for ourselves the operations of the plant and the working conditions of the men employed in it.

7. We recognize that much of the evidence received consists only in expressions of opinion, in many cases based on the statement of fact which we could not accept at their face value, without much fuller investigation. We believe, however, that the evidence as a whole portrays with a fair degree of accuracy the thoughts and conditions of mind of the industrial population of Canada.

Chairman's Address.

8. At the opening of the session in the City of Victoria, the Chairman, with the approval of the other members of the Commission, made the following statement:

9. "At the opening of our proceed-

ings I desire to very briefly give the reasons why this Commission has been appointed; the general topics upon which we desire to obtain information, and the results which we hope and trust may be achieved by our work.

10. "The upheaval taking place throughout the world, and the state of men's minds during this critical period, make this the time for drastic changes of the industrial and social systems of Canada.

11. "In view of this, the Government has created this Commission on Industrial Relations, charged with the duty of considering and making suggestions for establishing permanent improvements in the relations between employers and employees, whereby, through close contact and joint action, they can improve existing industrial conditions and devise means for their continual review and betterment.

12. "The Commission's report being intended as the basis for any recommendations or actions the Government may decide upon at the present session, time becomes an important factor, and therefore the Commission, in harmony with the terms of the Order-in-Council creating it, has decided to confine as closely as possible the enquiry to the following subjects:

1. Organization and Classification;
2. Unsatisfactory Conditions and Labour Troubles;
3. Remedies applied or suggested;
4. Profit-Sharing; Bonuses and Co-Partnership;
5. Joint Councils;
6. General Comment or Suggestions;
7. Mental Attitude.

13. "As far as possible, all persons so desiring and having anything of material value to offer on these subjects will be given a hearing, but in justice to others who may follow they are asked to be as brief as possible in their presentation.

14. "In July, 1917, the British Government appointed a Commission of Inquiry into the problem of industrial unrest, and in conclusion I do not think that I can do better than quote from its report:

"'What is wanted is a New Spirit—a more human spirit, one in which economic and business considerations will be influenced and corrected, and it is hoped will eventually be controlled, by human and ethical considerations. The main cause of unrest lies deeper than any material considerations. The problem is fundamentally a human and not an economic problem. A new spirit of partnership is therefore essential.'

15. "We are now ready to hear any person who has anything to offer along these suggested lines. It is proposed that any person who has any statement to make will be permitted to freely make it without interruption and without oath or formality, the idea being to elicit the real view of every person, expressed in his own language and his own way. As I have intimated, our time is extremely brief. We are expected to cover the whole of Canada before the 30th of June, therefore we must ask those who appear before us to make their statements as concise and as much to the point as possible."

16. As by the terms of our Commission we are required to consider and make suggestions for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and employees, we deemed it our first duty to inquire into the existing relations and to discover the extent and cause of industrial and labour unrest, which at present exists in Canada. That serious unrest does exist is abundantly established by witnesses representing different shades of opinion and by the number of labour disputes which have taken place during the last few months, some of which are still pending and others threatening.

17. The unrest is most pronounced in western Canada. There it assumes a distinctly different character from that which prevails in eastern Canada. In several western cities labour was represented by many holding extreme radical

views. Undoubtedly a portion of the labour unrest at present prevailing is to be ascribed to the upheavals in Europe and the disturbed state of the public mind generally owing to the war. This has given rise to a desire on the part of workers generally to secure a position for themselves in a comparatively short period of time, which otherwise might have been the result of evolution during a long period of years. This desire varies in degree amongst different groups of workers. One group lays down as a principle the complete possession by themselves of the machinery of production and the full product of their toil, whilst the group at the other extreme would be satisfied with merely a larger purchasing power of the wages they receive. In between these groups lie the more moderate, and we believe the majority, who would welcome co-operation and industrial peace until by a gradual process of evolution a system may be ushered in by which the workers will receive a more adequate share of what their labour produces.

18. Many employers are in agreement with the workers as to the need for an ultimate change in the basis of industry, but are not in agreement as to how to achieve this object.

19. All changes should be made step by step, because we can only see a little way ahead, and each successive step should be based on the experience gained by the steps already made. At the same time we should determine the general direction in which we want to go, which should be towards the health, happiness and prosperity of the workers and the service of the community.

20. The workers of this country are devoting a great deal of thought to the study of economic questions. This educational process is apparently going on amongst them to a greater extent than amongst the employers of labour. Some of the literature read may not be sound, and the mental training of some of the workers may not be of a nature to enable them to thoroughly understand it, yet we are convinced that the good sense and sound judgment of the majority of the workers enable them to discriminate between what is sound and what is unsound. For this reason, extreme doctrines have not been accepted by any but a minority of the working people. Though the advocacy of extreme views both by speech and by the distribution of literature may be a contributing cause to occasional outbursts, the real causes of unrest are of a more fundamental nature.

21. The chief causes of unrest may be enumerated as follows:

1. Unemployment and the fear of unemployment.
2. High cost of living in relation to wages and the desire of the worker for a larger share of the product of his labour.
3. Desire for shorter hours of labour.
4. Denial of the right to organize and refusal to recognize Unions.
5. Denial of collective bargaining.
6. Lack of confidence in constituted government.
7. Insufficient and poor housing.
8. Restrictions upon the freedom of speech and press.
9. Ostentatious display of wealth.
10. Lack of equal educational opportunities.

22. There were many other reasons assigned for unrest and dissatisfaction, some confined to particular localities, but the above embrace the causes most frequently expressed.

23. It is obvious that the best method of dealing with present unrest and establishing better relations between employer and employee is to remove the cause in so far as it is possible or practicable to do so. The following pages contain our suggestions to that end.

Unemployment and the Fear of Unemployment.

24. We have placed unemployment first because we found that there was the greatest unrest where there was the most unemployed. Unemployment was

found in several of the large urban centres. There is, however, little unemployment in the smaller towns and rural districts, notwithstanding the number of workers who have been released from munition work and the number of soldiers who have been discharged. In some manufacturing centres, such as Kitchener, there was actually a scarcity of labour.

25. In practically every Provice there is a great scarcity of labour on the farms. This scarcity is most pronounced in the three Prairie Provinces and in the Province of Ontario, but we heard the same complaint in Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The cause is to be found in the great disinclination of unemployed labourers to take this kind of employment. At one point we were informed by the local Government Employment Officer that he had on his books a list of 1,000 men asking for employment, while at the same time he had a list of 1,500 vacancies upon farms, but none of the 1,000 men could be induced to accept them. The chief reason assigned is an objection to the condition of life on the farm, its isolation, the hard and long hours of labour, the seasonal nature of employment and insufficiency of wages paid during the few months of employment to tide the farm labourer over the unemployed season, or to maintain his family in the urban centre.

26. An increasing number of the farmers would gladly employ men by the year, and in some cases provision has been made for providing a married man with a separate dwelling, but there is still a lack of such accommodation. The farmer imputes the reluctance of labourers to come to the farm to the fact that wages have become so high in the manufacturing plants of the cities, that they have got beyond the price which the farmer can profitably pay. On the whole we believe that if the unemployed of the cities could be induced to take service upon the farms, the unemployed problem, as it exists in Canada, would be largely solved.

27. In any movement to place the unskilled labour from the cities upon the farms, discretion would have to be exercised. The introduction of machinery and improved methods have made farming, to a large extent, a skilled industry requiring skilled labour. We were told by more than one farmer that the ordinary unskilled labourer from the city is, until he has acquired some knowledge of the industry, of very little, if any, use.

28. Some of the more permanent factors in the unemployment problem are the seasonal nature of many industries due to climatic conditions, lack of continuity in large construction works, and the great distance between some industrial centres.

29. Present unemployment is in a measure due to the curtailment of production in some industries because of the lack of ocean tonnage. The large number of orientals employed in the lumber industry in British Columbia was also complained of. It was stated that while white men were out of work orientals were employed because they could afford to work for less than the white men (owing to their higher standard of living) could possibly exist upon. On the other hand employers assert that white men will not do much of the work that orientals have usually done.

30. We were glad to observe that the returned soldiers have to a large extent been reabsorbed into civil life, generally by being taken back into their former positions.

31. Owing to the unsettled conditions, we found everywhere a great reluctance on the part of those possessing unemployed capital to risk it in new enterprises or in the expansion of those already established.

32. As a means of providing immediate employment several witnesses urged that the Governments—Dominion, Provincial and Municipal—undertake the prosecution of useful public works. The works suggested were dry docks, shipbuilding, railway extensions, building

of necessity roads and bridges and clearing the land for agricultural purposes.

34. On the wisdom or propriety of undertaking useful public works for the purpose of relieving temporary unemployment, the "memorandum" issued by "The Garton Foundation" in January of this year, on "Industrial Situation After the War" (p. 69) has this to say:

"Even with the most complete machinery that can be devised, it is difficult to see how a certain amount of temporary unemployment can be avoided if we are content to rely entirely upon the ordinary course of relations between supply and demand. This margin of unemployment could, however, be largely reduced, if not extinguished, by State and Municipal expenditure upon work of public utility. Such a policy will need to be carried out with care and closely watched from the standpoint both of public economy and industrial conditions. Employment of this nature can never form a permanent substitute for that arising from industrial activity, and it would be worse than folly to keep men engaged upon stand-by government or municipal work when the industries of the country were ready to receive them. All such work should, therefore, be undertaken in close co-operation with Employment Exchanges and the local committees representing employers and employed. It should also be confined to work of definite utility and, as far as possible, to undertakings of a productive nature, or connected with the restoration of the national plant. At the same time, it would be legitimate to anticipate to some extent work intended to be done in the near future in order to give employment at the moment when it is most needed. There is a large amount of really valuable work to be done in connection with housing, the repair and improvement of roads, afforestation, the reclamation of waste land, etc., which would prove a sound investment both from the social and economic point of view....."

34. But supplying the unemployed man with suitable work for the present will not entirely solve the problem. Before the labourer can be made contented the haunting fear of unemployment must be removed from his mind.

35. This is something which affects all wage earners, but more especially the casual labourer. He can never be sure just when his employment will terminate and he will be left without the means of subsistence.

36. Unemployment may arise from other causes than the loss of his job. He may be incapacitated by sickness, invalidity or old age. Very few labourers are able, out of their earnings, to make provision for these contingencies. We recommend to your Government the question of making some provision by a system of State Social Insurance for those who through no fault of their own are unable to work, whether the inability arises from lack of opportunity, sickness, invalidity or old age. Such insurance would remove the spectre of fear which now haunts the wage earner and make him a more contented and better citizen.

High Cost of Living in Relation to Wages.

37. From end to end of Canada the high cost of living was assigned as one, if not the chief, cause of labour unrest. The opinion was frequently expressed that if that problem could be solved, and the equilibrium established between the wages and the cost of living, labour unrest would largely disappear. We were told that although during the war nominal wages were advanced from time to time, real wages had not advanced because the rise in the prime necessities of life invariably kept just ahead of the advance in wages. It was stated that in many cases after the workers had secured an advance in wages the cost of the commodities immediately also advanced, so that the increase in wages had been immediately neutralized.

38. There exists in the minds of a great many people a deep-seated belief

that the high cost of living is due to profiteering in the necessaries of life, and that the chief instrument made use of to that end is the various cold storage plants. It is said that in some localities public markets have ceased to exist because the agents of those cold storage plants now intercept the supplies which the farmer would otherwise bring to the market for sale. In this way the frugal housewife who had been in the habit of going to the market daily for the family requirements of meat, vegetables, etc., can no longer make use of this means of supply. Those who suffer from this cause are not alone those ordinarily classed as labourers, but also the salaried classes.

39. Another cause which is blamed for the high cost of commodities is the present expensive system of distribution. The belief is widely entertained that there are too many middlemen, and that some system ought to be adopted which would bring the producer and consumer more in direct contact. As evidence of this necessity, our attention was directed to the great spread between the price realized by the producer and that paid by the ultimate consumer.

40. This subject was brought prominently before us as one of the chief contributing causes to the industrial unrest and we are glad to know that it is now being investigated by a committee of the House of Commons.

41. The high cost of living is closely allied with a desire by the worker for a larger share of the product of his toil. In fact, it appears as though the existence of the one gives rise to the demand for the other. Be this as it may, there is a settled conviction in the mind of the worker that he does not get a fair share of the value which his labour produces. Exactly what steps are to be taken to satisfy this demand has given rise to a great diversity of opinion amongst workers themselves.

42. To a considerable extent in the past labour has been regarded as a commodity to be bought and sold in the open market, the price to be paid being determined by the supply and demand. We believe that labour should no longer be so regarded, but that greater recognition should be given to human rights and human aspirations, and that the chief consideration in industry should be the health, happiness and prosperity of the workers and service to the community.

43. The first clause of the Labour Declaration in the Peace Treaty states that "labour should not be regarded merely as a commodity or as an article of commerce." That we believe to be the basic principle on which the dealings between the employer and the employee should be established; and if it is freely and frankly acknowledged by employers, and acted upon in good faith, we believe it will go a long way to improve the relations between them.

44. Without any extraordinary upheaval, policies may be adopted which will ensure to the worker a fairer reward for his toil, and a living wage, and insure him against want during temporary periods of enforced idleness because of unemployment, sickness or invalidity, and during old age.

45. As a means of improving the relations between themselves and their employees, many employers have put into practice different profit-sharing plans. It would not be correct to say that these profit-sharing plans have escaped criticism, but witnesses engaged as workers in industries where these plans are in operation agreed that they had promoted harmony in industry. In order that they may succeed it is essential that the recipients should be put in possession of the information necessary to enable them to judge whether they were getting a specified share of profits or a mere dole.

46. In several of the Provinces of Canada the absence of a minimum wage law, particularly for women and girls, was mentioned as a serious cause of dissatisfaction. In four Provinces—Manitoba, British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Quebec—there is such a law administered by a Minimum Wage Board, by which the minimum rate to be paid is

fixed from time to time. We believe that such a law should be enacted in all the Provinces, and should cover not only women and girls but unskilled labourers as well.

Hours of Labour.

47. We found at the great majority of places visited a demand by the workers for a shorter working day, based on their desires for more leisure and energy to devote to the things of life other than work, and a general approval by the employers in regard to this.

48. Many opinions were expressed by workers on this proposition. The most common request was for an eight-hour day with the Saturday half-holiday, where already established, and its further extension wherever possible, thus making the 44-hour week.

49. Approval by the employers was generally coupled with statements of difficulties with which they were faced. These were:

(1) The necessity for the utilization of all possible daylight where industry is subject to climatic conditions and must be carried on during a limited season. Examples of these were farming, fishing, logging, etc.

(2) The disadvantage of a section of an industry working shorter hours in competition with other sections of the same industry within Canada working longer hours.

(3) The fear of the inability of Canadian industry, with its small home market, to meet the competition in foreign markets if the conditions in Canada were advanced too far ahead of countries manufacturing similar products.

50. A shorter day is most needed in industries that are fatiguing, monotonous, or under trying conditions, such as heat, dust, cramped position, etc.

51. The number of hours worked should not be fixed by the ability to work them without undue fatigue, but should be based scientifically upon the demands of industry.

52. In many industries in Canada the eight-hour day has already been adopted, and it has been recognized by the Peace Treaty. We recommend that it be established by law throughout Canada, with due regard for the above consideration. Such legislation should provide for a weekly rest of at least twenty-four hours which should include Sunday whenever practicable.

53. Where a shorter day is now worked the enactment of such legislation should in no way interfere with such practice or with its extension.

Denial of Right to Organize.

54. Employers may be divided into three classes—(1) those who deny the right of their employees to organize and who actively take steps to prevent such organizations; (2) those who, while not denying that right of their employees to organize, refuse to recognize organization among their employees, and persist in dealing with them as individuals, or as committees of employees, without regard to their affiliation with the organization; and (3) those who not only admit the right to their employees to organize, but recognize and bargain with the organization on behalf of their employees.

55. There are not many employers in Canada who belong to the first class, but there are a very large number who belong to the second class. The employers who openly object to their employees organizing are not many, but, rightly or wrongly, the workers believe that numbers of employers who openly declare their willingness that their employees should organize, covertly interpose obstacles in the way of their doing so, and that employees who are active in organizing their fellows into Trade Unions are got rid of, or penalized in some other way. To the third class belong the great railway, telegraph and mining companies and many building trades. Outside of these, the employers of labour

who recognize and deal with organized labour as such are in the minority.

56. The Government of Canada, by Order-in-Council passed in July, 1918, make a declaration of policy with respect to organizing. One clause of this Order-in-Council provided that "All employees have a right to organize in Trade Unions, and this right shall not be denied or interfered with in any manner whatsoever, and through their chosen representatives they should be permitted and encouraged to negotiate with employers concerning working conditions, rates of pay, and other grievances."

57. On the whole we believe the day has passed when any employer should deny his employees the right to organize. Employers claim that right for themselves and it is not denied by the workers. There seems to be no reason why the employer should deny like rights to those who are employed by him.

58. We believe the frank acknowledgment of this right by employers will remove one of the most serious causes of unrest. The employers gain nothing by their opposition because, notwithstanding much opposition, their employees do organize, and the refusal but creates in their mind a rankling sense of injustice.

59. Not only should employees be accorded the right of organizing, but the prudent employer will recognize such organization, and will deal with the duly accredited representatives thereof in all matters relating to the interests of the employees, when it is sufficiently established to be fairly representative of them all.

60. The right to organize would be more fully recognized, we believe, if the distrust and lack of confidence at present existing could be removed. One pronounced cause of this lack of confidence is the number of cases in which it was claimed that trade agreements entered into have not been faithfully observed. Allegations of lack of observance were made by both employer and employee. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that in some sections representatives of local trades unions have advocated extreme measures. The selection of such men and the advocacy of these measures, we were led to believe, was the logical outcome made by both employer and employee, of unjustifiable opposition by some employers. The adoption of the principle of the sympathetic strike has arisen from the refusal of groups of employers to grant the claim of the organized workers. These factors have been assigned as the chief causes of the non-observance of contracts entered into by the workers in numerous cases, especially in western Canada. This policy is not recognized by the international trades unions who believe in the due observance of agreements entered into by themselves or on their behalf. It cannot be denied that trades unions generally have brought many solid advantages to workers, in the form of increased wages, shorter hours and improved conditions.

61. When the employers engaged in one line of industry are organized and their respective employees are also formed into a central organization, a bargain between the two groups would have the advantage, from the point of view of competition, of equalizing wages, hours and other conditions affecting costs.

Collective Bargaining.

62. Collective bargaining is a term which implies the right of workers to group themselves together for the purpose of selling their labour power collectively to their employer instead of making individual agreements. It is sometimes carried on by an employer and a committee of his employees. To make this effective on the side of the workers, men have organized themselves into Trade Unions, and many of these are again federated into central councils such as the Building Trades Council, Metal Trades Council, etc. Employers in a like manner sometimes control one factory, sometimes a chain of factories, and in some instances have organized into larger associations of the

industry to which they particularly belong. These associations have again in some instances become part of federations such as the National Association of Building Contractors and Supply Men, with local branches in many of the larger cities, and many other similar groups.

63. These several forms of organization have led to much confusion in the application of the term "collective bargaining." In its simplest form collective bargaining is the negotiating for, and the reaching of, an agreement between some employer and some particular groups of employees, through their respective craft unions. With the growth of larger industrial establishments, and the absorption of the individual employer in many cases by the larger corporations employing many classes of labour, the attempt to reach suitable agreements by each grade of labour separately led to continual stoppages of work. For example, where a building contractor, employing some nineteen different classes of tradesmen, all organized into separate trade unions, negotiated separately with each union, too great a proportion of time was taken up in negotiating these nineteen separate agreements, and the failure to reach an agreement with any one of them generally resulted in the complete tie-up of the entire work for the time being. In such cases it has been found mutually satisfactory for the employees merely to combine their demands and present them through the medium of a building trade federation to the employer, and in this way settle at one time the conditions for the entire industry. It does sometimes happen under this system that another employer doing say, only carpenter and brick work might not be interested in the parts of the schedules relating to the other seventeen building trades; and it might also happen that the final presentation of this combined schedule was made by a small committee of the federated body on which the carpenters and bricklayers might not be represented. This has been given by some employers as a reason for refusing to meet such a committee. We see no reason for this attitude, because if any one suffered by not being directly represented it would be the worker himself, and not the employer. Many Trade Unions keep in their employment trained men for the purpose of negotiating their different schedules. The employer has the right to select any representative or bring in any assistance that he may desire in carrying on the negotiations, and there is no logical reason why the employees should be denied a like right.

64. In the case of partly organized industries due recognition should be given to employees' organizations where they exist, in accordance with the declaration of the Dominion Government Order-in-Council of July, 1918, quoted under the preceding title. At the same time the employer is justified in knowing that the schedule presented is put before him with the concurrence of a fair proportion of his employees. Whether it is put before him directly by a committee of his employees, by a direct representative of the Trade Unions to which they may belong, or through the Committee of a Federation of Trade Unions to which their particular union may belong, should not be made an issue.

65. Collective bargaining is the negotiation of agreements between employers or groups of employers, and employees or groups of employees, through the representatives chosen by the respective parties themselves.

66. Entering into agreements and bargaining collectively with Trade Unions does not mean recognition of the "Close Shop" unless the agreement so provides. Numerous cases came under our observation where this method of collective bargaining was carried on where both Union and non-Union men were employed.

Lack of Confidence in Constituted Government.

67. The complaint was made at several places that legislation enacted at the request and for the benefit of la-

bour was not adequately enforced. Nor was the rise in the cost of commodities controlled in the manner that they believed it was possible for the Government to control it. The belief appears to be entertained that the Governments, both Local and Federal, are largely controlled by the financial interests, and that their influence was manifest not only in legislation but in the executive action of the several governments. As evidence of this they pointed to the large profits which, according to the public press, were made by corporations dealing in foodstuffs and other necessary commodities, excessive rents, etc. These considerations, it was alleged, had shaken the faith of the working classes in Governments as at present constituted.

68. The remedy suggested was a system of election by which the worker could secure better representation in Parliament. The means suggested for bringing this about was the adoption of a system of proportional representation from grouped constituencies. We understand this system has been in operation for several years in Belgium and Sweden, and we believe the proposal is well worth serious study by a committee of Parliament.

Insufficient and Poor Housing.

69. Another cause of unrest which we met with at practically every place we visited was the scarcity of houses and the poor quality of some of those which did exist. In nothing has production more signally fallen off during the four years of war than in the building of dwelling houses. The existing condition for the worker is not only the absence of sufficient housing accommodation, but the inadequacy of those that are in existence. Poor sanitary conditions and insufficient rooms are the chief complaints. The high price of building land and of building material have made it impossible for the worker to provide himself with a home, and some means should be adopted, with as little delay as possible, to remedy this defect.

Restriction upon the Freedom of Speech.

70. The restrictions placed upon freedom of speech and the liberty of the press, and the denial of the right to read such literature as any portion of the public demanded, was given as one of the principal causes of the present industrial unrest. We have no comment to make upon the policy of the Government in this respect. During the war it was necessary in the interests of the whole country and of the Empire that individual liberty should in many directions be restrained, but we believe that restrictions should not be imposed upon either the freedom of speech or the freedom of the press unless such restrictions are urgently demanded in the interest of the peace of the whole community. We recognize that no person has a right to do anything that is liable to incite the people to commit unlawful acts. A line must be drawn between liberty and license, but care must be taken to avoid creating the impression that the restraints imposed upon the freedom of speech or the liberty of the press, are intended to prevent criticism of legislative or governmental action.

Ostentatious Display of Wealth and Lack of Equal Educational Facilities.

71. Ostentatious display of wealth by those who can afford it, and the lack of equal educational opportunities for the rich and the poor, were also spoken of.

72. Schools and colleges are at present open to the children of the employer and the employee alike; but the crux of the complaint is that generally the income of the wage earner is not such as to enable him to afford them the means of attaining a higher education. The change desired is one which will give the child of the poorest paid worker the opportunity of reaching the highest educational institution.

Shop Committees and Industrial Councils.

72. There is urgent necessity for greater co-operation between employer and employed. The great obstacle to such co-operation is the suspicion and distrust with which in many cases each regards the other.

73. It is only fair to say that in many cases the relations between particular employers and their employees were found to be harmonious. In all such cases the guiding principle was a frank recognition by each of the rights of the others. At present the worker has little or no knowledge of the difficulties which beset his employer, the cost of raw material, the working expenses, the competition which he has to meet, the risks of his capital, and the margin of profit which he receives; and the employer is equally ignorant of the employee's difficulties and viewpoint. This ignorance gives rise to disputes as to rates of pay, hours of labour, and the hundred and one questions which could be largely solved if each side understood what the other had to contend with. As a means of eliminating that suspicion and distrust and "for securing a permanent improvement" in their relations and in the conditions of the worker, several forms of Joint Works Committees or Joint Industrial Councils have been adopted and are now in use in England, Canada, Australia, the United States and elsewhere.

74. There are three types of Joint Industrial Councils now in operation:

(a) the Whitley Works Committees and Industrial Councils, in operation in Great Britain;

(b) what is generally known as the Colorado Plan, in operation in some parts of the United States and Canada; and

(c) Industrial Democracy, as put into effect by John Leitch in a number of factories in the United States.

75. The Whitley Report, which resulted in the formation of many Shop Committees and Joint Industrial Councils in England, recommends the formation for each national industry of three classes of organization: (1) A National Joint Council; (2) District Joint Councils, and (3) Works Committees. The National and District Councils are composed of equal numbers of representatives of employers and employed. The representation on Works Committees need not be equally divided as decisions must be arrived at by agreement between the two parties.

77. All Councils are formed voluntarily by employers and workpeople in each industry. As a preliminary to their complete formation there must be organization both by the employers and the employees in the particular industry as the Councils are composed of representatives nominated by the Employers' Association and the Trade Unions concerned. Under this plan each Council arranges its own functions, machinery and methods of working.

78. Concerning the respective functions of District and National Councils and Works Committees, the Third Supplementary Report of the Whitley Committee says: "In every industry there are certain questions, such as rates of wages and hours of work, which should be settled by district or national agreement, and with any matter so settled no Works Committee should be allowed to interfere; but there are also many questions closely affecting daily life and comfort in, and the success of, the business, and affecting in no small degree efficiency of working, which are peculiar to the individual workshop or factory. The purpose of Works Committees is to establish and maintain a system of co-operation in all these workshop matters."

79. One of the basic principles in the establishing of Industrial Councils under the Whitley plan is to avoid confliction with either Government or Trades Union machinery in existence for the adjustment of matters of wages, hours, etc., and in paragraph 14 of the

First Interim report it is carefully stated that it is of the "highest importance" . . . "to secure the support of the Trades Unions and Employers' Associations concerned. The Council's designs should be a matter for agreement between these organizations"; also "The District Councils should be created or developed out of existing machinery for negotiation in the various trades."

80. In the City of Toronto a Joint Council, which closely resembles the District Joint Council under the Whitley plan, has been formed and is in actual operation in the building trades, and similar Councils are projected for these trades in the City of Ottawa and the City of Montreal. There is also in existence a Works Committee in the Coughlan Shipyards at Vancouver, and the formation of Councils in other industries is under consideration.

81. What is known as the Colorado Plan with modification has been adopted in the American Sash and Door Company of Kansas City; the Andover Steel and Iron Company; the Cambria Steel Company; the Bethlehem Steel Shipbuilding Corporation; the Philadelphia Rapid Transit Company, and others in the United States, and in Canada the Imperial Oil Company; the International Harvester Company; the Massey-Harris Company, the Vancouver Dairy Company and several others. Under this plan Joint Committees composed of equal numbers of representatives of workers and of the Company are formed. The representatives of the workers are elected by secret ballot in proportion to their numbers and no distinction is made between union and non-union men. In this respect they differ from the Whitley plan where organization is a preliminary to the constitution of the Council and where representatives are nominated and elected from the membership of the particular Unions.

82. In the City of Winnipeg one hundred employers of labour have proposed a plan for the formation of Joint Plant Councils somewhat after the manner of the Colorado Plan, but including the formation of Provincial Joint Councils and Dominion Joint Council.

83. The Leitch plan, which he calls "Industrial Democracy," is in operation in more than twenty plants and is based upon the Constitution of the United States. The complete organization consists of a Cabinet, a Senate, and a House of Representatives. The Cabinet consists of the executive officers of the Company and is primarily an executive body with veto powers. The Senate is elected and made up of under executives, departmental heads and foremen. The House of Representatives is elected by secret ballot by the whole body of workers. The working of this plan is fully described by Mr. Leitch in his book entitled "Man to Man" (B. C. Forbes & Co., New York). The business policy set before the workers is justice, economy, co-operation and service, and they benefit financially by receiving fifty per cent of the savings on the cost of production.

84. In the case of both the Imperial Oil and the International Harvester plans, both management and some employees expressed their entire satisfaction, and their confident belief that the plan would work harmoniously and well and had brought about a great improvement in the relations between employer and employed. Other employees of the Oil Company and organized labour expressed disapproval because of the belief that the adoption of a Council was a scheme to get rid of the labour unions. By others a suspicion was expressed that the employer had some ulterior motive, not in the interests of labour.

85. In order to allay suspicion the employers should not prepare a plan of Joint Councils and submit it in a completed form to the employees to be accepted or rejected. Employees should be invited to co-operate with the employer in formulating the plan. It would thus be the joint product of both, and would consequently be received by the employees without the suspicion that so

often attaches to something which emanates from the employer alone.

86. In none of the plans in operation in Canada is there provision for the recall of any representative of the employees whose conduct as a member of the Council has proved unsatisfactory to those by whom he was elected. Provision should be made, we think, for the right to recall and new election.

87. Adequate provision should be made for meetings of employees at which the members of the Council can explain proposals that have been brought before it and obtain the views of the workers generally thereon. Means should be provided for publishing the results of Council meetings in some convenient form for the information of the employees generally.

88. Provision should be made for the possibility of a dead-lock arising in the Council, and means by which the dead-lock could be broken, either by the selection of some independent arbitrator, or by some other means.

89. Representatives should be protected against discharge or any other penalty unless approved by a majority of the workers' representatives on the Council.

90. It also should be made clear that the organization of the Council was not intended to supplant trade unions and that no impediment would be placed in the way of the workers forming or joining a Union if they choose to do so.

91. Where there is a Trade Union or Unions, the representatives of the employees on the Council should be selected by the Union Organizations if it is the desire of the workers to do so; otherwise the Council should be elected from the employees in any manner they may select.

92. In a general sense we think Joint Industrial Councils or Works Committees should consist of a number of employees elected in one of the manners suggested, and a number not in excess of that number of the executive appointed by the management. There should be a stated time for meeting, not less frequently than once a month. It is not possible nor is it desirable to suggest any hard and fast rule as to how such Councils should be constituted, or what their functions should be. These are matters which ought to be worked out with the employers and employees in collaboration.

93. The Whitley plan provides for the establishment of District and National Councils in addition to Plant Councils, otherwise called Works Committees. It seems probable that District Councils having jurisdiction over industries of a like character operating in a given area, or even National Councils, may be required for the purpose of securing uniformity, etc., but it would be unwise to attempt at the beginning an organization of too elaborate a character. The establishment of such District or National Councils will naturally evolve when the necessity arises. Where more than one form of Council in the same industry is established care should be taken to carefully delimit their respective functions to prevent overlapping and friction.

94. We suggest the following as proper subjects to be dealt with by such Councils:—

(1) Wage rates;
(2) Hours of labour;
(3) Conditions surrounding the worker in the plant, such as safety, ventilation, light, sanitation, provision for meals, dressing rooms, shelter, etc.;
(4) Child and woman labour;
(5) Questions of discipline and conduct as between management and workpeople;
(6) Conditions surrounding the worker outside the plant, such as education, amusement, recreation, health, housing, apprenticeship or special training, libraries, etc.
(7) Improvement in the plant or process to improve quality, increase production, decrease waste, etc.,

and the reward of those who think out and suggest such improvements.

95. The authority and scope of the Council would grow with experience. The worker would in this way be given an increasing share in the control and responsibility without unduly interfering with the necessary functions of management.

96. The essential feature of all the proposals is that the human factor in industry is to be regarded as of first importance. They aim at improving the standard of comfort of the worker by securing a greater measure of close co-operation between him and his employer; of eliminating distrust and suspicion by full discussion of all the facts and circumstances pertaining to the industry. They tend to bring the employee and the employer closer together, and give each a better understanding of the difficulties which beset the other; give the worker a greater sense of responsibility by giving him a greater voice in the government of the industry, and thus bring about a permanent improvement in their relations.

97. The general principle of Industrial Councils can with advantage be adopted in Canada, but we doubt whether any particular plan now in operation could be applied in its entirety. Our great area, sparse population, diversified climate and manufacturing conditions make it undesirable to attempt the fully developed machinery of any of these plans at the beginning. A commencement should be made with Joint Plant Councils, and the more extensive organization of District and National Councils evolved therefrom as their necessity and practicability become apparent.

98. Every Council, or by whatever name it may be known, must be the result of the unfettered choice of both the employees and the employer concerned. Any attempt to force a definite plan upon either would be foredoomed to failure. Some machinery should, however, be established to take the initiative and bring the parties together.

99. We therefore recommend that the Government should interest itself in the development of these Councils, and that a bureau should be established under the Minister of Labour which would compile all available statistics on this subject, undertake publication of developments in this and other countries, maintain officers who would be available to give assistance and act as liaison Officer between employer and workers where desire is expressed to create such Councils, and render such other assistance as may be required.

100. In those industries where the number of employees are few, and the employer is constantly in close touch with his men, the necessity for any form of Council is not felt. In others a system of shop committees has long been in operation with satisfactory results. Where a system has grown up which is agreeable to both parties, and under which harmonious relations have been maintained, it would be unwise to endeavour to substitute any other machinery. It is only where no such machinery is in operation or where there appears to be need of a change, that the establishment of Industrial Councils is recommended.

101. We are under no illusions as to Industrial Councils constituting a universal panacea for all industrial troubles. Their usefulness will depend upon the spirit with which they are adopted. We believe, however, that nothing but good can possibly result from their establishment in all industries, where a considerable number of workpeople are employed.

102. The coal operators of the Province of Alberta have suggested as a means of preserving harmony in their own particular industry the establishment of a permanent court consisting of one representative nominated by the workers, one by the association, and a Chairman selected by these two, or appointed by the Government, to which

all questions of dispute could be referred for speedy settlement. The operators were prompted to make the suggestion by their experience of the Fuel Controller during the past few years. There are a large number of coal mines being operated in that Province, many of them small and unimportant. For this reason the plan suggested by these operators may be better suited to the conditions prevailing there than the establishment of Industrial Councils.

Classification of Industries and Organizations.

103. Owing to the limited time at their disposal, your Commissioners found it impossible to fully comply with the terms of the Commission requiring them to make a survey and classification of existing Canadian industries.

104. We found that the employers had several forms of association, notably the Employers' Association, with local branches and Industrial Sections in the important urban centres; the Manufacturers' Association, similarly grouped employers; also there were many local Builders' Exchanges, and in process of formation a National Body of Builders' Supply-men and Contractors, with head office at Montreal. Employers in the Mining, Metal, Lumber and other trades also had their associations, but with few exceptions we were told they were not for the purpose of arranging or controlling hours, wages or general works conditions. They might, however, where they do not do so, be able to extend their powers to enable them to become representative of Industrial Councils.

105. The Workers' Organiations are more numerous and varied than those of the employers. Some trades had local, district and provincial councils, with affiliation to International Union, notably the Machinists, Carpenters, Shoe Workers, Bricklayers, Electrical Workers, Printers, etc. These are again federated with closely allied crafts as in the case of the Building Trades Councils, Allied Printing Trades Councils, Federated Shop Trades, Canal Trades Federation, Marine Trades Federation, Metal Trades Councils, etc. In one case, the Railway Shop Trades, they are combined into a Federation covering the entire Dominion. The Marine Trades have consolidated to the extent of having two Semi-National Federations, whilst other trades are confined to much more restricted areas.

106. Some workers are also organized into independent and non-international Unions, particularly in the Province of Quebec, one at least of which is incorporated, namely "L'Union Nationale des Ouvriers de la Rive-Sud." (National Union of Workers of the South Shore.)

Conference Suggested.

107. If it is finally decided that the enactment of any legislation necessary to give effect to our recommendations is not within the competence of the Parliament of Canada, we suggest that in order, if possible, to secure concerted action on the part of the different Provincial Legislatures, a conference should be held in the near future in the City of Ottawa. To this conference we suggest that the Premiers, or other members of the Governments of each Province, together with representative labour men and representative employers, be invited for the purpose of considering the whole question, and, if possible, arriving at a unanimous decision. We believe it is in the interest of harmony that concerted action along this line should be taken, and we know of no better means of bringing about unanimity. At such conference the question of unifying and co-ordinating the existing legislation bearing on the relations between employer and employees, now in force in the several Provinces and in the Dominion, might be carefully considered and reviewed.

Summary.

For convenient reference we list below our conclusions:

We recommend that legislation be enacted to provide for:

(a) Fixing of a minimum wage, specially for women, girls, and unskilled labour. (Par. 46.)

(b) Maximum work day of 8 hours and weekly rest of not less than 24 hours. (Par. 52.)

We recommend immediate enquiry by expert boards into the following subjects, with a view to early legislation:

(a) State insurance against unemployment, sickness, invalidity and old age. (Par. 36.)

(b) Proportional representation. (Par. 68.)

We recommend that suitable action be taken by the Government to:

(a) Regulate public works to relieve unemployment. (Par. 31.)

(b) Help the building of workers' homes. (Par. 69.)

(c) Establish a bureau for promoting Industrial Councils. (Par. 99.)

(d) Restore fullest liberty of freedom of speech and press. (Par. 70.)

Other general recommendations are:

(a) Right to organize. Recognition of Unions. (Par. 59.)

(b) Payment of a living wage. (Par. 44.)

(c) Collective bargaining. (Par. 65.)

(d) Extension of equal opportunities in education. (Par. 72.)

(e) Steps towards establishment of Joint Plant and Industrial Councils. (Pars. 85 and 98.)

(f) That the findings of the Commission be put into effect in all work controlled by the Government where the principles of democratic management can be applied.

We believe that great good would result from the printing and distribution of the Evidence and our Report now submitted. The Evidence should be divided into convenient volumes, as follows:

1.—British Columbia.
2.—Prairie Provinces.
3, 4.—Ontario.
5.—Maritime Provinces.
6.—Quebec.

A sufficient number of copies should be available to furnish to all organizations and interested individuals who may make application for same.

In conclusion, your Commissioners desire to say that they have had a unique opportunity of observing the manufacturing, mining and agricultural resources of this country. They were impressed by the variety, magnitude and character of many of the manufacturing and industrial plants visited, and by the enterprise displayed in their operation. What is required to make the Dominion great and prosperous and its population contented and happy is a spirit of co-operation on fair and equitable lines amongst all classes. We have suggested a means by which co-operation may be promoted; but the worker is looking forward to a changed condition of life and a new status in industry, and we must be prepared to meet the changing conditions as they arise, in the same spirit of co-operation and good will.

The nations of the world by the Peace Treaty have adopted principles which until now were but ideals. As Canada is just entering the stage of greatest development we have an opportunity unique among the nations for growth in harmony with those new principles.

We desire to express our acknowledgments to all who assisted by furnishing us with books, pamphlets and documents bearing on the subjects under inquiry; also to the mayors of the several cities and towns visited for the use of the council chambers for our meetings.

All of which, together with the evidence, is respectfully submitted this 28th day of June, A.D. 1919.

(Signed)
T. G. Mathers, Chairman.
Carl. Riordon,
Chas. R. Harrison,
Tom Moore,
John W. Bruce.

Thos. Bengough,
Secretary.

Report of Commissioners White and Pauzé

To His Excellency the Governor General in Council,
Ottawa.

Sir,

Your Order-in-Council, P. C. 670, dated April 4th, 1919, referring to the formation of this Commission, makes the following request:

1. To consider and make suggestions for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and employees.

2. To recommend means for ensuring that industrial conditions affecting relations between employers and employees shall be reviewed from time to time by those concerned, with a view to improving conditions in the future.

For the above purposes the Commission shall:

1. Make a survey and classification of existing Canadian industries.

2. Obtain information as to the character and extent of organization already existing among bodies of employers and employees respectively.

3. Investigate available data as to the progress made by established joint industrial councils in Canada, Great Britain and the United States.

In compliance with this request your Commission left Montreal on the evening of April 20th and, since that date, have held meetings throughout Canada, covering, practically, the whole industrial territory of the Dominion, as far as Edmonton in the north, Victoria in the west, Sarnia in the south, Sydney and Halifax in the east.

(1) In making a "Survey and Classification of existing Canadian Industries" it was found that a great variety of industries exist in Canada, but owing to the extent of the geological domain, the difference in climate and other features, these industries are carried on under quite different conditions, which would make legislation affecting labour intended to apply to the whole Dominion, difficult, if not almost impossible.

In all parts of Canada there are seasonable occupations, such as lumbering, fishing, fruit and fish canning; and in some parts of the Prairie Provinces, agriculture. These industries are carried on for a few months in the year only, and it is necessary for those engaged in them to follow some other than their regular vocation for the balance of the year, if they wish to be fully occupied. This applies to building trades in many parts of Canada where our climate makes it impracticable to carry on building operations during certain seasons of the year. These conditions, necessarily, create a certain amount of unemployment; and the argument advanced where such conditions maintain, is that the rate of wages paid should be higher on account of the short season that employment is afforded, than where the same occupation is not seasonable but steady, as is the case in other districts.

The variety and extent of industries in Canada has been a matter of surprise to your Commissioners, and it is with satisfaction that we note many of these industries are of new creation during the last few years, while many others have enlarged their plants to fill the demand for their goods.

We found demobilization of the army in Canada has created very little industrial disturbance. Where returned men were willing to resume their former occupations, employers as a rule had reinstated them, giving them the advantage of any increase in wages, or advance in position they may have lost owing to their absence on service.

A number of returned soldiers have elected to take their discharge at certain centres owing to the attraction of climate or other local reasons; this has created some embarrassment, as there is a larger number of discharged men at, for example, Victoria and Vancouver, than would properly belong to these cities.

A number of Imperial soldiers who did not serve with the Canadian corps have, we understand, recently come to these cities, but generally speaking they

were all being satisfactorily taken care of. Although there are numbers of unemployed soldiers in all centres this was not considered by the citizens to be a matter of alarm as owing to the changed conditions under which these men have lived during the war, they were not expected to immediately resume their former occupations or new occupations. This condition appeared to be fully appreciated by local communities generally and no adverse criticism was made upon it, the opinion being that all such cases would gradually get back to satisfactory occupations within a short time.

We are pleased to report that the behaviour of the returned soldier, individually or as a class, has not been a cause of complaint before this Commission.

(2) With regard to the "character and extent of organization now existing among employers and employees": there does not appear to be organization of employers on the same lines as the organization of employees. A number of organizations exist among employers but generally these organizations are for the purpose of selling or the interchange of views with regard to general matters affecting the welfare of their plants. From evidence given before this Commission, and as far as we could learn from enquiry, employers had no organizations for the purpose of enforcing uniform scales of wages or other conditions in their plants to offset the organizations of employees. If it is the intention of the Government to encourage organization of Trades Unions, organization of employers should also be encouraged that both parties may meet with, at least comparatively speaking, equal comprehensiveness. The organization of employees include different schemes and are not uniform. In many large industrial centres throughout Canada, especially in the West, it was found that organized labour associations are at variance one with the other, fighting for control. The largest trade organization is that known as "The Trades and Labour Council" which is affiliated with International Trades Unions, with headquarters in the United States. The Canadian local unions are organized under authority of these central bodies and appear to be the most completely organized unions in Canada. Organized labour has made an active campaign for membership during the last two years, and owing to war conditions this campaign, insofar as increasing their membership is concerned, was successful and has resulted in creating a cleavage in their ranks. This cleavage has come through the organization known as the "One Big Union." Apparently the older and better established unions aimed at increasing membership and perfecting their organizations that they might acquire strength to approach the government and obtain by constitutional means what they consider will be to their advantage.

With the successful growth of membership, many of the new and more radical element became restive and hoping to secure their ends by more rapid means created the new organization, with the policy of substituting force in the last resort, for constitutional means.

In the Province of Alberta this "One Big Union" was in part recruited by Austrians and other aliens who, owing to the scarcity of labour in the local mines and other industries throughout this province, had been fully employed during the war. These aliens, for their own protection, are 100 per cent organized, and any organization willing to include them in its membership found it easy to do so. War conditions created such demand for production that when highly organized bodies of this character made demands upon the operators they were obliged to grant them rather than have curtailment in production. The ambition and programme of this organization can be found in a review of what has happened in the City of Winnipeg during the last five weeks. Although there are a number of fairly well organ-

local unions in the province of Alberta and British Columbia and elsewhere, they do not in our opinion represent the majority of the labour population. A great many concerns although not objecting to their employees belonging to unions or other organizations, refuse to deal with or to recognize officially associations of organized labour as such.

Another class of labour organization is found in the district of Quebec where "L'Union Nationale des Ouvriers," incorporated at Ottawa on the 20th March, 1918, exists, and, apparently, operates to the satisfaction of both employers and employees. This organization claims a membership at present of from 25,000 to 30,000 workmen. One principle of this organization is compulsory arbitration; strikes or stoppages of work pending adjustment of differences between employers and employees become a violation of the rules, and machinery is provided for the adjustment of disputes. From the evidence given to this Commission we have reason to believe this organization is at present equally satisfactory to both the employer and employees. This organization is, in principle, local, in the sense of being Canadian, as against International Unions, which they do not recognize or deal with.

In several centres, notably in Sarnia and Halifax, Workmen's Councils have been established by the Imperial Oil Company. Briefly these councils are organized as follows:—

Officers of the company gave the employees a general outline of the proposed scheme, which it is proposed to envolve by experience, by announcing in the plant at Sarnia, where 1,200 men are employed, their desire that the men elect from groups of 200 a representative to the Council. No nominations were made, the choice of their representatives being left entirely in the hands of the workmen who voted for their candidate by ballot. Six representatives of the men were thus elected, the Company appointing six of their office staff to represent the management and the general superintendent or general manager being chairman. In the composition of this council, neither foreman nor superintendent, nor those whose duty it is to engage or discharge men, are eligible for membership, as one of the questions which may be dealt with by the council is the wrongful discharge or laying off of men.

In order to secure freedom of debate a member of such council cannot be discharged during his term of office without the consent of the council itself, and the meetings of this joint council are held in the company's time or during working hours when the members draw the regular pay of their respective positions. The council deals with all questions affecting the general welfare of the men, such as sanitation and other conditions, hours of labour, wages or changes in the system of operation; and the intention of the company in having its representatives on the council to meet the men, is that where recommendations are made involving the expenditure of money, the former are in a position to explain to the men why such representations cannot in some cases be fully carried out, but the company practically binds itself that when a unanimous recommendation comes from the council it will be acted upon. This scheme is an honest attempt to bring the employer and employees closer together and in our opinion should make for harmony and increased efficiency.

Unfortunately the Trades and Labour Council and International Unions appear to regard this scheme as unfriendly towards their organizations.

The evidence given by employers throughout our investigation urged that greater production both in agriculture and manufacture is necessary for the future prosperity and welfare of Canada, and although recognizing that the workpeople are entitled to a larger remuneration for their labour, owing to the increased cost of living and other conditions, they did not concur in the view that curtailment of the hours of labour would bring about this condition. Rep-

resentatives of organized labour urged that an eight-hour day be granted them by legislation; they also admitted that a six-hour day would be their ambition in the near future.

As the practice throughout Canada is to make wage agreements on a rate per hour rather than by day or week, it is difficult to appreciate, when employees are content and willing to work a longer day to earn an increased wage, why objection to their so doing should be so strenuously made. In many industries where the work exacts great physical effort on the part of the worker, there is no doubt the eight-hour, or even a shorter day, might be not only fair but necessary, but in other industries where the condition of labour is not so exacting there did not appear to be any great desire for a shorter day unless a corresponding increased wage was granted.

The Trade Unions object to the system in force and practice in many industries, namely, that of piece-work.

In some industries it would appear this system is not only accepted by, and satisfactory to the workpeople, but has been so long the custom that it has become almost necessary to the proper operation of the factory. In boot and shoe industries in Quebec city, one of its largest industries, although the factories work nominally nine hours, owing to the piece-work operations being consecutive, that is one piece-worker furnishing the work to the next in series, the piece-worker actually works eight hours or less, as the full staff are not all working at the same time. Certain groups begin the work which is passed on to others, but must dry before handling, and in this way although the factory works nine hours, the workers are really only occupied for eight hours or less. When piece-work and time-work are employed in the same factory, usually the piece-worker will earn higher wages than those on time and the higher wage makes this system popular.

If the piece-work was done away with, and the view as expressed by organized labour accepted, it would decrease the output of these factories. Another objection urged by organized labour is to the practice prevailing in certain centres of giving work to people who do not actually perform the work in the factory —that is, homework. A notable example of this is found in Kitchener, Ontario, and other towns. We are advised that little objection, until recently, has been taken to this practice, which we are advised has been a great assistance to many people living in these centres. Employers maintain their action is not for the purpose of obtaining work at a cheaper rate, but as many of their former women employees leave their factory occupation to take up house-keeping, they are very glad to supplement their income by taking work to their own homes, which they are thoroughly competent to execute, and the price paid is the same as that paid in the factory. This also is an assistance to a class of people whose circumstances do not allow them to work in the factory, but who are very willing to do such work under the conditions which have prevailed in many places for years. This work related to the whitewear,—shirts, collars, slippers—and other industries where expert sewing is required.

Care should be taken that where this system is practised, rigid inspection of the homes where such work is performed should be made, and the employer should be held responsible for the sanitary and other health conditions.

Speaking broadly, there does not appear to be any serious unemployment in Canada, although there is a considerable number of unemployed,—a condition largely due to an unequal distribution of labour.

There is universally throughout Canada a demand for farm labour, but many men who are unemployed at centres where this demand was greatest were either unwilling or physically unfit to follow this vocation. In several centres there was an actual shortage of labour, more especially skilled labour. This condition may possibly be remedied

by the return of the men from overseas, and it is hoped that the educational training schools established by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment will help to remedy the situation.

We understand the Government proposes to deal with, and is obtaining information with reference to the cost of living through another Commission.

(3) Besides the industrial councils outlined as established by the Imperial Oil Company, the International Harvester Company, Proctor & Gamble of Hamilton, the Steel Company of Canada, and many other large concerns are endeavouring to create organizations to encourage employees to bring before the management grievances or suggestions as to the improvement and general welfare of the plant. There is a collective bargaining through such committees or joint councils.

Considering the several classes of labour organizations in Canada, and the unsettled condition this brings about at present, the Whitley plan as established in Great Britain would not, in our opinion, be suited to our conditions. In Great Britain, both employers and employees have had organizations for a number of years, and their industries are in groups of comparatively small geographical area. The British workmen are usually of one nationality, whereas in some plants in Canada employees who appeared before this Commission gave evidence that 21 different nationalities were employed in the same plant. It would appear, therefore, without any adverse criticism to the Whitley plan as proposed in Great Britain, that conditions in Canada both with regard to the organizations of the employers and employees, and the varied nationalities and conditions to be dealt with, makes its practicability doubtful in Canada, although in certain districts and possibly with certain plants this scheme might be successfully applied.

The Colorado plan or a plan similar to that now under experiment by the Imperial Oil Company and others would in our opinion be more workable.

The figures given by the LABOUR GAZETTE on the cost of living were quoted to this Commission on many occasions by witnesses who used these figures to justify the claim that their wages were not adequate to cover the bare cost of living. In our opinion, it is almost impossible to give figures that accurately portray the varied conditions found in different centres throughout Canada, and we would suggest that this class of information be carefully revised or discontinued, as it is misleading and frequently has a disturbing influence on the workingmen. We would point out that in centres such as Kitchener, Sudbury, Cobalt, Sarnia, Moncton, Grand'Mere, Shawinigan, where organized labour has not been encouraged, but where the wage scale and other conditions have been fairly satisfactory to the worker, as employers do not appear to have difficulty in obtaining an adequate supply of labour, an excellent object lesson is supplied.

The original intention, as understood, of labour organizations, was to promote the welfare and better the conditions of labour generally, and if these purposes are adhered to there would be no room for criticism, but when the aims of the officers of these organizations become more political than industrial, encouraging unrest and fermenting dissatisfaction, an undesirable situation is created.

While we did not find serious unemployment, the cessation of war industries, the period of readjustment, as well as the return of soldiers, has undoubtedly created a condition that should be seriously considered. Canadian industries cannot be enlarged or further developed without capital, and if labour disturbances frighten capital from new investment a serious state will inevitably follow.

Some large industries visited by your Commission did not look hopefully upon the immediate future, considering that a period of readjustment must be undergone before they can consider

further extension of their operations. This may mean in the near future the closing of several large plants and the possible unemployment of a number of men. It would not appear, therefore, to be an opportune time for labour to make demands for wage increases.

Employers throughout Canada are, as a class, willing to meet and come to understandings with their men, but the exaggerated profits disclosed by certain manufacturers have had the effect of making the workman feel that he is not getting his fair share of the present prosperity. This, as well as many matters conducive of industrial peace, might be improved by a propaganda of education, applicable to the employer as well as to the employee.

The petition from the coal operators of the province of Alberta asks that an industrial court to consist of a representative of the men, a representative of the management, and a chairman to be either a judge appointed by the Government or to be selected by the first two appointees, be established and that this court or courts be located conveniently close to the mines; that disputes or differences of opinion that may arise between the operators and their men could be submitted to such court and disposed of rapidly, thus removing causes of irritation and in many cases financial loss to both sides owing to the absence of machinery to deal with such questions promptly. The operators, it is understood, are willing to be bound by the decisions of such courts, provided such decisions are also made binding on the employees. Similar courts might, with advantage, be established in other parts of the Dominion.

Many conditions complained of do not come, in my opinion, within the scope of Dominion legislation, but are largely provincial, civic or local in character, and as the provinces already have considerable legislation on their statutes, such as Workmen's Compensation, Factory Acts and others dealing with the welfare of workpeople, if these laws are properly enforced by competent officers, there should be little ground for complaint from operatives in respect to general conditions.

Suggestions were urged by a number of witnesses that the Government consider the desirability of legislation looking to the establishment of old age pensions as well as unemployment insurance. We consider the Government will be well advised to seriously consider the effect of such legislation upon the effort of the individual worker, before reaching a decision upon these matters.

The Commission did not have presented to it any evidence as to the practical working of either of these state schemes as now established in Great Britain, but from information that cannot be considered official we are given to understand that these state schemes in their operation and results have been subjected to some adverse criticism by those whom they were supposed to benefit. Further, it must be remembered that in the administration of unemployment insurance, the Government of Great Britain is assisted by highly organized labour organizations, and it is our opinion that in Canada we have not such at present to give proper effect to such a scheme. When the system of joint councils is generally established, these might be a proper medium for the administration of such a scheme and might then justify the recommendation of such legislation.

I did not find, during our tour, although this did not come directly within the scope of our inquiry, any real poverty throughout Canada that was not being properly taken care of by local institutions, and if a system of old age pension or unemployment insurance were established it might seriously affect the ambition of the worker when he had the full enjoyment of his physical and mental capacity. The opportunities afforded to the industrial worker in Canada who has sufficient education to take advantage of them are abundant. In some of the most prosperous manufacturing towns visited it was found that 96 per cent of the employers had at one time

best workman, rising by industry and thrift to the ownership of an industry. Many witnesses representing labour advanced the idea that our present system of constitutional government is unfair and unpopular. They claimed there should be proportional representation, which as explained by the witnesses appearing before this Commission meant that our parliament should be elected in three parts: one-third representing labour, one-third representing agriculture, one-third arts, science, professional and other elements which they group together.

It was pointed out to these witnesses that the present system of election under our constitution does not limit the representation to any one class and that if organized labour is sufficiently strong it might elect a House of Commons representing 100 per cent of its own views. In our opinion this idea has not been developed on proper lines and is not worthy of serious consideration, as the present constitution gives every part of the community an equal voice in the selection of representatives.

As the evidence obtained by your Commission reflects opinions of employers and employees throughout practically all the principal towns in Canada, we recommend that the Government have the full evidence printed as quickly as possible, that it may be available for the information of not only the Senate and the Members of the House of Commons, but also employers and employees, and others throughout Canada who may be interested.

The evidence is of considerable volume and we would further suggest the desirability of printing it as taken in each town separately, that the information may be available to those interested in a special locality in convenient form. This would be a matter of economy as well as convenience, and supplementary copies of certain portions of the evidence could be printed later if required.

In conclusion, we would suggest, as a means of permanent improvement in relations between employers and employees, that the petition of the mine operators of Alberta, for the establishment of a local court where disputes might be referred without loss of time, be considered, and for the purposes of enforcing the judgments that might be rendered by such court, that the miners' union be urged to adopt some form of incorporation.

We would also suggest the encouragement of industrial joint councils as established in some large manufacturing concerns in Canada; also that where industrial councils are established that employers and employees be urged to institute forms of co-operative insurance or other provision for pensions to long term employees, sick or invalided.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) Smeaton White.
Frank Pauzé.

Ottawa, Canada,
June 25th, 1919.

Supplementary Report of Commissioner Riordon

In signing the Report, I stated that I did so subject to comments which I would add, and the other signers were willing that I should do this. I give these comments below.

By the terms of our Commission we were required to consider and make suggestions for securing a permanent improvement in the relations between employers and employees.

I think that the great trouble with these relations is that the worker is not satisfied with the living he gets from his work.

The evidence throughout shows that merely raising wages does not give the worker a better living, but that this can only be got by dealing with wages and the cost of living together. Increased wages and increased charges add to the burden of industry and check it.

The main problem has to do with sharing the national wealth, which is the product of work, capital and resources.

The share of the worker can be increased only: (1) by increasing the wealth to be shared by decreasing waste; (2) by decreasing the share of the other parties to the production of wealth, and (3) by reducing to a minimum the share of those who are not parties to the production of wealth.

We should minimize such wastes as (a) parallel railway lines; too many retail stores, etc.; (b) plants standing idle part of the twenty-four hours; (c) sickness and under-nourishment; (d) poor quality in products; (e) bad use of by-products and raw materials—we need more research; (f) unemployment.

We need more capital, but the price at which it is offered depends on the risks. The following remarks show what I mean by risks and their remedies:

(A) *The variation in the actual consumption of goods as between good times and dull times.*—Consumption depends on the buying power of the people. If employment were complete and continuous, and if all the people were assured of income in case of misfortune, the buying power would be maintained about even at all times.

(B) *Bad construction and bad management.*—There would be fewer failures if charters to incorporate enterprises were granted only when it was shown that (1) they would be carried out by men who could show by their past record that they were fit to carry them out; (2) that the plants would be properly located, the process and construction the best, and the market sufficient.

(C) *Disturbances.*—Co-operation and the square deal would do away with labour disputes. Justice and a fairer distribution of wealth would lessen the chance of political disturbances.

After paying all charges, including adequate wages and adequate interest or fixed dividends on capital, and after providing sufficient reserve, all profits

should be divided between the parties to production.

The community and the parties to production should be protected by publicity with regard to assets, liabilities, earnings, costs, prices, etc., based on authorized standard systems of accounting.

It seems clear that the share of wealth produced that goes to those who come between the producer and the consumer is altogether too great, and that this can be remedied by co-operative trading as practiced in Great Britain, and that this should be encouraged and wisely directed by Government.

In the case of grants by the Government for any of the purposes mentioned in the Report, I think it should be clearly understood that the Government has no real wealth to give but is merely an intermediary that takes wealth from one party and gives it to another. For instance, a grant by Government to any form of social insurance should be a contribution by those who have much to those who have little and are unfortunate, and so should be by way of income tax, on the principle that luck plays a part in the distribution of wealth.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) CARL RIORDON,
Commissioner.

Montreal, June 29th, 1919.

BINDING SECT. MAY 3 1972

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY